

stated to the calendar was to save time and expense. It is a bill local in nature and there is no particular hurry about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon withdraws his request.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, on that point I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the precedent is laid down in Gilfry's Precedents, page 221, where a motion was made to take up a bill which had been indefinitely postponed at the previous session, and it was held by the Senate to be in order. The question was left to the Senate and it was held to be in order by the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the bill had been indefinitely postponed, how could it be taken up? It did not exist. That was a most extraordinary ruling, whoever made it.

Mr. FLETCHER. In Gilfry's Precedents it is given as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1869.

The President stated that the bill proposed to be taken up, having been postponed indefinitely by a vote of the Senate on the 25th of July last, at the last session, and returned to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, with the action of the Senate thereon, which he believed, by the uniform practice of the Senate, was regarded as a rejection of the bill, and that the bill, not now in the possession of the Senate, the motion to take it up did not appear to him to be in order, and that the effect of the indefinite postponement of the bill being involved in the question of order, he would prefer to have it decided by the Senate, and therefore submitted the question of order to the Senate: "Is the motion to take up a bill which has been indefinitely postponed by a vote of the Senate at a previous session of Congress in order?"

After a somewhat lengthy discussion the Senate decided, by a vote of 27 yeas to 18 nays, that the motion of Mr. Morton was in order. (See Cong. Globe, pp. 568, 569, 570, 590-593, 623-625, 665-667.)

Mr. SMOOT. That had been done at a previous session. It was not at the same session of Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. That would only make the case stronger.

Mr. WARREN. It was also a House bill, as I understood the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. It was a bill that came over from the House.

Mr. FLETCHER. I merely referred to it to show what the Senate has done.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the right of the Senator from Oregon to withdraw his request. There is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If there is no further business, I was going to move that the Senate adjourn. I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 8, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 7, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. William Couden, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, strong to save, be with all who ride in peril on the sea. Guard our ships and transports and enable us to overcome the threatening dangers of the elements and of our military enemy. Comfort those who are in anxiety and sorrow. Increase our determination for the right and our bravery to endure, to dare, and to do.

Of old Thou didst encourage the saints with unusual evidences of Thine approval. We are far from laying claim to be saints, dear Lord. Yet we sincerely and humbly believe that in our stand for justice and humanity we are supporting a cause that is precious to Thee. Give unto us, therefore, courage and cheer and tokens of Thine approval and signs of sure victory. We ask this in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADDITIONAL MESSENGER, HOUSE POST OFFICE (H. REPT. NO. 290).

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 240.

Resolved, That the Postmaster of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ an additional messenger in the House post office, who shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$100 per month during the remainder of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, this is the same resolution introduced about 10 days ago, but was withdrawn at the request of the Committee on Appropriations, and amended according to their request.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state the necessity for this additional messenger?

Mr. PARK. I can only state that the Postmaster said that he is necessary for the business of the office. The Postmaster appeared before the committee and made a complete statement, and the committee unanimously reported the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. It is the hope that the employment of this extra messenger will give us a more prompt delivery of mail matter and obviate the delays that have heretofore occurred?

Mr. PARK. It will have a tendency to do that.

Mr. WALSH. In what way?

Mr. PARK. By giving more help.

Mr. DOWELL. What position will this messenger occupy?

Mr. PARK. An assistant at the stamp and registry window, I understand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. This resolution, as I take it, is in lieu of the resolution that the Committee on Accounts reported providing for an additional register and stamp clerk, who was to receive a salary of \$1,500?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say in the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill the subcommittee had occasion to call upon the Postmaster of the House, and it was agreed that this official should be appointed as a messenger rather than assistant to the clerk at the window for the sale of stamps and looking after registered matter. This is a substitute in lieu of the former resolution.

Mr. DOWELL. Does this in any manner relieve others of the work they are to do?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; it simply provides an additional clerk. The Postmaster stated that at times during the day there was such a large demand for stamps and registering matter and business connected with the parcel post that it was necessary to have two clerks at the window rather than one, and, while it was his desire to have an additional clerk at \$1,500, it was the judgment of the committee that it could be done by a clerk at \$100 a month.

Mr. DOWELL. And this messenger is to act in that capacity?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is proposed that he will act in that capacity.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 6361. An act to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3317. An act providing for the removal of snow and ice from the paved sidewalks of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1735. An act to create an additional judge in the southern district of Florida.

ADAH B. SAUER (H. REPT. NO. 292).

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 238.

Resolved, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Adah B. Sauer, widow of Charles L. Sauer, late an employee on the roll of the House, a sum equal to six months' compensation as a messenger on the soldiers' roll, and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray the funeral expenses of said Charles L. Sauer.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 2180. An act to approve mutual cessions of territory by the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota and the consequent changes in the boundary line between said States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1004. An act to provide for a retirement system in the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1005. An act to regulate the salaries of keepers of light-houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 993. An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 932. An act to provide for stock-watering privileges on certain unallotted lands on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 934. An act authorizing the State of Montana to select other lands in lieu of lands in section 16, township 2 north, range 30 east, within the limits of the Huntley irrigation project and the ceded portion of Crow Indian Reservation, in said State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 936. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city of Bozeman, Mont., certain land for alley purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 937. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 955. An act providing for noncontiguous homestead entries within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., of land of the character described in the enlarged homestead act of February 19, 1909; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 44. An act granting additional rights to settlers on reclamation projects; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 26. An act authorizing the cutting of timber for mining purposes by corporations organized in one State and conducting mining operations in another; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1555. An act to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 95. An act to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 102. An act relating to the temporary filling of vacancies occurring in the offices of register and receiver of district land offices; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 352. An act granting pensions to certain members of the former Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 994. An act extending the benefits of care and treatment by the Public Health Service to seamen on vessels used in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1462. An act to establish a fog signal at the Port Washington Pierhead Light Station, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1463. An act to establish aids to navigation at Fond du Lac Harbor, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1849. An act permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry of the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 940. An act to provide for the payment for certain lands within the former Flathead Indian Reservation in the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1084. An act for the relief of J. G. Seupelt; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2886. An act for the relief of Albert O. Brown; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2487. An act permitting Frances Mack Mann to purchase certain public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3470. An act to amend section 35 of the Criminal Code of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3471. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant furloughs without pay and allowances to enlisted men of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3472. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to provide and issue distinctive buttons or badges to men drafted or volunteering for enlistment in the military forces who are exempted or rejected, and to provide a penalty for unlawfully wearing, procuring, or manufacturing the same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3526. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 935. An act for the relief of settlers on certain railroad lands in Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 302. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make donation of condemned naval guns and cannon balls to the John Wannebo Camp, No. 9, United Spanish War Veterans,

Everett, Wash., to be placed in public parks; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 3446. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1917; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 179. An act for the relief of Fred C. Konrad; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2784. An act to authorize the purchase by the city of McMinnville, Oreg., of certain lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and revested in the United States by the act approved June 9, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3225. An act to reserve as a part of the Oregon National Forest certain lands that were revested in the United States pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Oregon & California Railroad Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2315. An act to extend the time within which final proof is required to be submitted upon any lawful pending desert-land entry made prior to July 1, 1915, such extension not to exceed three years from the date of allowance thereof; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 97. An act authorizing the exchange of certain lands in the State of Utah for the protection of the water supply of Salt Lake City; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 94. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L., p. 1133); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2931. An act for the relief of Thomas Sevy; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 972. An act to authorize an exchange of lands with Henry Blackburn; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 388. An act for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Mrs. Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William E. Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, Sophia Huff, Peter H. McBride, David Edward Adams, Mrs. M. J. Ellsworth, and the heirs of J. H. Frisby; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 101. An act to authorize the consolidation of Government lands and of privately owned lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3128. An act to amend section 1422 of the Revised Statutes authorizing additional pay for enlisted men of the Navy, and Marine Corps, detained beyond the expiration of their terms of enlistment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 714. An act providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 922. An act for the relief of Orion Mathews; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3403. An act for the relief of Paymaster Alvin Hovey-King, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 92. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain lands in the State of Utah to E. D. Partridge; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 387. An act for the relief of John Flanagan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2865. An act for the suspension of payments on public lands by entrymen in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution to permit of the disposition of certain lands in Montana ceded by the Crow Indians; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

EUGENE J. HOLLAND (H. REPT. NO. 291).

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

House resolution 177.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Eugene J. Holland, clerk to Charles Martin, a Representative from the State of Illinois at the time of his death, October 29, 1917, the sum of \$166.66, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Representative in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, before moving to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. The day before yesterday, when we adjourned, it was agreed that the general debate on the bill should continue for 2 hours and 10 minutes, 20 minutes of that time to be controlled by myself and 1 hour and 50 minutes by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. COOPER. Since that time both of us have had requests for additional time. I ask unanimous consent that that unanimous-consent order be set aside and that the time for general debate be set at 5 hours; 2 hours and 50 minutes of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin and 2 hours and 10 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate upon the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill be extended so as to make it 5 hours, 2 hours and 50 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin and 2 hours and 10 minutes to be controlled by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, that, of course, is exclusive of the time granted to the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. TILSON.

The SPEAKER. Certainly; that has nothing in the world to do with it. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

THE OLD SOLDIER.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein two communications, one from the William McKinley Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Canton, Ohio, and the other from the General Canby Post, at Hood River, Oreg. When Gen. SHERWOOD yesterday made the request to extend these in the RECORD I objected. Since that time I have found that the communications are of an exceptional order, and I do not think objection should be made to them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SHERWOOD, may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in accordance with his request made yesterday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The communications referred to are as follows:

WILLIAM MCKINLEY POST, No. 25, G. A. R.,
Canton, Ohio, February 2, 1918.

HON. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND COMRADE: William McKinley Post, No. 25, of which you were a member once, have been watching your conduct in and out of the Halls of Congress to bring a greater measure of relief to the old veterans who are striving to maintain homes of their own during these days of high cost of living. We have your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the soldiers' homes and those who are compelled to go there and those who have been and are receiving benefits of these homes who have property, money, and even farms outside, besides their pension, to live upon. We commend your remarks along these lines and the fight that you are so gallantly making for the amelioration of the old "boys," who are now feeble and in ill health. Permit us to thank you on behalf of William McKinley Post, No. 25, Grand Army.

Yours in F. C. L.,

WILLIAM W. PUMPHREY,
HENRY R. PACKER,
CHAS. T. OLDFIELD,
Committee.
ALFRED GARNER, Commander.

HOOD RIVER, OREG., December 23, 1917.

Gen. SHERWOOD.
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Through the courtesy of the Representative from this district, Hon. N. J. SINNOTT, your bill (H. R. 6883) was received and read at the regular meeting of Canby Post, Grand Army of the Republic, yesterday.

The bill amending the pension law of May 11, 1912, meets with the hearty approval of the comrades of the post. We have many old and feeble comrades in this department who need help, and to whom the amendment, if it becomes law, will prove a blessing.

As adjutant of the post I was instructed to write both you and Mr. SINNOTT and tender the thanks of Canby Post for the deep interest both of you have always taken in the welfare of old soldiers.

Pardon me for not writing your initials. The name of Gen. SHERWOOD is known to every Union soldier living, but, like myself, probably not one in a thousand could call your initials.

Thanking you personally, I am,

Yours, truly,

SAMUEL F. BLYTHE,
Adjutant Canby Post, No. 16.

TORPEDOES.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the story is told of an old professor of Greek who had spent his long life in a somewhat

thorough study of the dative case in the Greek language. When he came down to die and reflected upon the work of his life he expressed the one regret that he had scattered his efforts too much by not confining himself to the dative of cause. For a long time I have given considerable study to the subject of war munitions. For the most part my efforts have been directed toward the arms and ammunition used by our land forces. It might have been wiser had I continued to confine my labors to that rather ample field. However, the subject of my remarks to-day is so closely related to my pet subject that I may be excused for venturing to enter upon it. The awful disaster to the *Tuscania* yesterday makes it timely.

I purpose to talk to you on the torpedo. I shall not attempt to consider its tactical use or its place in the naval program, for I am not a naval man and do not feel competent to discuss the subject from that angle. I shall treat it as ordnance—a weapon, a projectile. The fact that water is the medium through which it is directed on its deadly mission is only incidental so far as my purpose is concerned.

For many months after the outbreak of the present war in Europe the world was flooded with a stream of publications called Red Books, White Books, Blue Books, Yellow Books, Orange Books, Gray Books, all sorts of books telling the causes of the war and trying to locate the blame for it. After reading all of these different books different people came to different conclusions. When the United States entered the war, we issued a Red, White, and Blue Book telling "Why America is in the war." There may be those so impervious to truth that even our book may not be accepted as conclusive. However, in my opinion, the cause of our being in the war now lies here in front of the Speaker's desk.

DESCRIPTION OF TORPEDO.

This is the afterbody, with engine and steering gear of a full life-size torpedo, though it is not alive, I assure you. The use of this death-dealing machine in a manner contrary to international law and in contravention of the long-established usage of civilized nations forced us into the war. By the courtesy of Admiral Earle, and by the help of Lieut. Commander Hoover at the navy yard here in Washington, this torpedo is here for the inspection and information of the membership of this House. I shall attempt to explain it briefly, though in large measure it explains itself.

This particular type of torpedo is 45 centimeters in diameter and 5.2 meters long. There has been a wise and well-directed effort to standardize torpedoes, especially as to diameter, so that they have been reduced to practically two sizes, 45 centimeters (a little less than 18 inches) and 21 inches. You will see how important this is when you consider the torpedo tubes and other launching problems. The largest torpedo now made is 21 inches in diameter and 21 feet long. These figures are easily remembered.

The head of this weapon, called the war head, is here [indicating]. It is filled with about 250 pounds of guncotton, T. N. T., or some other fiendish explosive. By far the greatest weight and length are here in the air flask [indicating]. It is a forging made of a very high grade of nickel steel, and costs in the rough-turned forging, without any finishing work, about 47 cents a pound. The forging for the largest type weighs about 3,300 pounds. The flask contains air under very high pressure, which, when heated, is the propelling force of the torpedo.

Here is the bulkhead [indicating] between the air flask and the afterbody, and to it are attached the engine and heating device.

This is the engine [indicating], and it is one of the finest pieces of mechanism made. It weighs about 100 pounds and develops about 150 horsepower.

This is the afterbody [indicating] and here inside of it is the gyro steering gear. Through the afterbody runs the shaft, or the two shafts, one running inside of the other.

Last of all come the two propellers [indicating] arranged tandem, but they are not twins, and they revolve in opposite directions. The slight difference between the two is made necessary by the different character of the water in which they work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why are those propellers moved in opposite directions?

Mr. TILSON. In order to stabilize the torpedo. If you had but one propeller the reaction from the working of it would roll the torpedo over.

I have here a photograph of the launching tubes used on our destroyers. It was not practical to secure a photograph of the launching tube used in battleships and cruisers. I did have made a very fine photograph of the torpedo tubes used on submarines.

It was so fine, in fact, that the Navy censor declined to allow me to use it.

The single torpedo tube is used in the larger ships. It is below the water line, under the protection of the armor plate, and in the side of the ship.

Destroyers are practically the only boats that now use over-water tubes. It is too dangerous on the capital ships to have the torpedo exposed in this way, as I shall explain more fully in another connection.

I am very much disappointed in not having a picture of the torpedo tubes used on the submarines, but, as I have just explained, my photograph brought out every detail, so that the Navy censor was unwilling for me to make it public. There is a nest of four tubes built into the bow of the submarine, pointed in the same direction that the submarine is pointed, so that there are four torpedoes ready at all times to discharge.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. When a torpedo is projected from the tube, is it not the momentum with which it travels that holds it on a level course at a certain depth under the water or on top of the water? In other words, when it ceases traveling it would sink, and is it not the momentum that holds it up, or is there some mechanism that holds it on a level?

Mr. TILSON. There is a depth rudder, just the same as the rudder of any boat, except that it is horizontal instead of vertical.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is on the rear end of it?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. There is one horizontal rudder and one vertical rudder.

Mr. HAMLIN. What holds up the front end? Is it not the speed at which it travels? It is the momentum that keeps it on a level, is it not, or is it that air flask?

Mr. TILSON. The air flask helps to balance the torpedo in the water; but, as a matter of fact, it is so made as to sink when it stops.

Mr. HAMLIN. That was my understanding, and that it was the momentum of the torpedo that kept it going on the straight line.

Mr. TILSON. I do not so understand it.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then what keeps it from sinking before it stops if it is not the momentum that holds it on its level course?

Mr. TILSON. It is because it is balanced. It will lie like a log in the water.

Mr. HICKS. I rather think that torpedo will float at all times.

Mr. TILSON. It will, normally.

Mr. HICKS. I thought the gentleman said it would sink.

Mr. TILSON. It is made to sink. A war torpedo is made so that when it stops running it will sink.

Mr. HICKS. I beg to differ with the gentleman—

Mr. TILSON. There is a sinking valve for that purpose. If it floated on the surface after it stopped, it would be dangerous to all comers. It is so arranged that when the torpedo stops its sinking valve automatically opens and allows it to sink.

Mr. HICKS. I did not understand about the valve. The way the torpedo is constructed, it will float unless there is some device to make it sink?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, certainly.

Mr. HICKS. That is the point.

Mr. TILSON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. NEELY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. NEELY. What is the motive power that turns that propeller?

Mr. TILSON. It is the compressed air in this air flask, heated to a high temperature, with water injected into it to form steam; superheated air, with the injection of water. The air flask contains the motive power to run this engine [indicating].

Mr. KNUTSON. When is the air put into the air flask, and when is it heated?

Mr. TILSON. The air is put into the air flask in advance, and it is not heated until after it starts on its journey, as I will show presently, or I can show it now, for that matter. When the torpedo is projected out of the launching tube by the force behind it, either black powder or compressed air, it enters the water. In sliding out of the tube this lever is tripped by striking against a projection on the launching tube. That sets the engine inside going, the heating device is lighted up to heat the air, and the air, which is under great pressure, is forced from the air flask through the engine. That is the way it works.

Mr. HAMLIN. How deep under the surface of the water can these torpedoes be projected from the submarine?

Mr. TILSON. They can be projected at practically any depth. Naturally they are set to aim at the most vital part of the ship, and the depth is determined somewhat by the size of the vessel at which the torpedo is aimed.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then, a submarine can fire these torpedoes even though submerged? It does not have to come to the top to fire them?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, no; not at all. It does not matter how deep it is when it fires the torpedo or how near the surface, because this rudder [indicating], controlled by the pressure diaphragm, will soon bring the torpedo up to the proper level or down to the proper level, as the case may be. It is determined by the depth for which it is set originally.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. How is it aimed under water?

Mr. TILSON. It is aimed by the aid of the periscope. The boat itself is aimed, because, as I have described to you, this nest of torpedo tubes is built right into and is part of the boat.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit me to ask what keeps the torpedo upright and prevents it from getting on one side so that the wrong rudder comes into play?

Mr. TILSON. Gravity, in the first place.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Is there more weight on one side than the other so as to keep it upright?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I mean is there more weight on the bottom so as to keep it upright?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, yes; it balances the torpedo in a right-side-up position.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. POU. Would the gentleman prefer to complete his statement and then answer questions?

Mr. TILSON. Thanking the gentleman, I should like to proceed with the history of the development of the torpedo for a few minutes. I promise to be brief, and then I will submit to any questions which gentlemen may wish to ask me.

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT.

The development of the torpedo is a very interesting story, to which I shall refer briefly, but only to the comparatively recent part of it. In 1890 the Secretary of the Navy entered into a contract with John Whitehead & Co., of Fiume, Austria, under the terms of which that firm agreed to assign the Whitehead torpedo rights for the United States, on a royalty basis, to such firm or corporation in the United States as the Secretary of the Navy might select. The E. W. Bliss Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., having agreed to equip a plant suitable for making the torpedo, was designated by the Secretary and acquired the rights accordingly. Lieut. T. C. McLean, on behalf of the Navy Department, and Mr. Frank M. Leavitt, representing the Bliss Co. proceeded to Fiume for the purpose of studying the weapon and its mode of manufacture.

WHITEHEAD TORPEDO.

The Whitehead torpedo of that day was a cigar-shaped affair carrying an explosive charge of gun-cotton in its head, which charge was exploded by contact with the target. It was propelled through the water by means of a three-cylinder engine known as the "Brotherhood" type. The motive power was compressed air carried in a strong steel storage flask occupying the middle body of the torpedo and extending about half its length. The driving engine was located in the afterbody and connected directly to the propeller shaft with two propellers arranged tandem, as in this one. One of the propellers was made to revolve in the opposite direction from the other by means of a system of gearing located in the tail of the torpedo. The reason for this arrangement is that if one propeller is used the reaction of the driving shaft will roll the torpedo over in the opposite direction. By having a second propeller turning the other way these forces are balanced.

The propeller shaft was made hollow and the exhaust air from the engine passed through it and clear of the torpedo abaft the propellers. A pair of horizontal rudders steered the torpedo down to the proper depth and kept it there throughout its flight.

The main driving engine was placed in a compartment of the afterbody, which was open to the sea, so that in operation the engine was submerged in water. This arrangement was made necessary by the fact that air in expanding through an engine has the property of losing heat, so that the engine in a short time would be frozen solid. The sea water supplied the necessary heat.

EARLY STEERING GEAR.

There was at that time no adequate means for directing the torpedo in a straight course. Two small rudders attached to the tail counteracted any marked tendency of the torpedo to deviate from the line, and the best position for these rudders

had to be established by a series of trial runs. This crude method would not have availed except for the fact that the effective range was not more than 800 yards.

In those early days the submarine had not been developed, nor had the submerged launching tube such as is now used upon battle ships and cruisers. The torpedo was launched from an overwater tube of practically the same type as that shown in this photograph. The launching tube may be described as a steel or bronze tube, having a rear door, mounted upon a swivel base, so that it may be trained upon the target. It somewhat resembles a breech-loading gun, though of course much lighter. The torpedo is placed within the tube and ejected by a light charge of powder or by compressed air. The powder charge is generally used in overwater tubes and compressed air in submerged tubes for obvious reasons. In order to start the engine of the torpedo a lever which operates the throttle valve extends through the shell of the afterbody, and as the torpedo moves out of the tube this lever strikes against a projection in the tube which opens the valve. The torpedo enters the water with its engine going and proceeds under its own power. Its horizontal rudders steer it down to the depth for which it is set to run and hold it at that depth until the engine stops at the end of the range. When headway is lost so that the rudders can no longer have control, the torpedo floats on the surface and can be removed.

SINKING VALVE.

In practicing with the weapon in time of peace there is of course no explosive charge used. Its place is taken by an equal weight of water. In a war shot, carrying the guncotton charge, should the torpedo miss its mark and not be exploded it would be a serious menace to friend as well as foe. A sinking valve is therefore provided, used only in an actual war shot, by means of which at the end of the run the torpedo is sunk.

The Whitehead torpedoes first introduced into the United States Navy had a length of about 11 feet and a diameter about the same as our present smaller type. It carried an explosive charge of 80 pounds and had an effective range of 800 yards at a speed of 26 knots. It was soon superseded by a larger type containing an explosive charge of 120 pounds with a speed of about 2 knots more at the same range.

During the years 1891 and 1892 the Bliss Co. equipped its plant and constructed 100 of these torpedoes, which were delivered to the Navy Department in 1893. The plant had a capacity of 100 torpedoes per year, this being the department's idea of the requirements of the Navy.

At that time expert naval opinion was very much divided in regard to the utility of the torpedo as a weapon of war. Perhaps a majority of naval men considered it little better than a pretty toy. The consequence of this widely prevailing sentiment was that the enterprise languished, and instead of the orders coming in for 100 a year, for which the company was equipped, they came in a desultory way; some years none at all.

The earlier cruisers in the service were equipped with overwater tubes, but these were discarded because the tactical value of the torpedo was not considered sufficient to equal the risk of disaster to the ship arising from a chance shot striking and exploding the air flask of a charged torpedo. The field of operation of the weapon became, therefore, restricted to the torpedo boats.

The combined result of all these adverse conditions would have relegated this weapon to the limbo of forgotten things had it not been for the introduction of three new factors which revived its spark of life. These were the submarine boat, the underwater launching tube, which enabled the torpedo to be kept below the water line under the protection of the armor plate and to be launched below water through the ship's side, and finally a new type of torpedo having a far greater range and efficiency.

OBRY GEAR.

While there had been no material advance in range during this period a decided improvement had been made by the introduction of a device for controlling the direction of the torpedo and insuring its traveling on a straight course. The "Obry gear," named for its inventor, an Austrian naval officer, consisted in the application of the gyroscope for the purpose of steering. In fact the gyroscope has made possible the present-day torpedo.

THE GYROSCOPE.

Mr. Leavitt, to whom I have already referred and upon whom I have drawn most freely for what I have been stating, says that the principle of the gyroscope seems intricate and mysterious to the lay mind, to which I fully agree. He also says that in reality, at least in so far as it is utilized in the torpedo, it is quite simple and easily understood. He admits that in its practical application there is much complex detail, which an

examination of my exhibits here will prove. He insists that the general principle of the gyroscope is simple, so I shall insert here his explanation of it. "If a solid mass like a flywheel is revolved at high speed in any given plane of rotation, it will continue to revolve in that plane unless some outside force acts to deflect it. This seems to be a self-evident proposition, but it is the whole thing in a nutshell. If, therefore, we mount a flywheel in gimble rings within the torpedo in such a manner that it is absolutely free to turn in any direction and then spin it up to a high speed like a top, the torpedo may be turned in any direction, but the flywheel will remain in the same position as that in which it was spun up. It is exactly similar in this respect to the compass needle. The ship may be turned in any direction, but the needle still points to the north. Similarly, if our flywheel is spun up with its axis pointed toward the target it will continue to so point without regard to the direction which may be taken subsequently by the torpedo."

GYRO CONTROL.

Assuming the explanation of the principle to be thoroughly understood, he explains the application of the gyroscope to the steering mechanism as follows: "If the revolving flywheel is connected with the valve of the steering engine in such a manner that should the torpedo leave the original line in which it was aimed, thus changing its position in relation to the fixed position of the flywheel, a rudder is operated to cause the torpedo to turn in the opposite direction, it must needs travel in the direction in which the axis of the flywheel points."

The most important elements of the Obry gear may be described briefly under five heads. First, a flywheel mounted in gimble rings, very similar to the toy gyroscope sold on the street. Second, a mechanism for locking and holding it with its axis in the axis of the torpedo while it is being spun up. The torpedo being aimed at the target, the axis of the flywheel will be pointed in the same direction. Third, a mechanism which, at the instant the torpedo starts in the launching tube, spins the flywheel up to a high speed. Fourth, a mechanism which, after the flywheel has been spun up and before the torpedo is clear of the launching tube, withdraws the locking device, thus permitting the torpedo to turn in any direction without affecting the position of the flywheel which continues with its axis pointing toward the target. Fifth, a steering engine controlling the rudder and itself controlled by the position of the torpedo in relation to the position of the flywheel.

The Obry gear worked wonders for accuracy in direction and control, but added nothing to the range of the torpedo. In 1897 Mr. Leavitt began consideration of the subject of increasing the range and speed of the torpedo by heating the compressed-air charge. It was a well-known fact of physics that the ability of air to do work could be increased by the application of heat.

I do not know that the hot-air proposition would apply in the same way to our discussions here in the House, but it is so with the torpedo. [Laughter.]

Up to that time no means had been devised by which it could be practically accomplished in the torpedo. Other improvements were proposed, such as substituting the Curtis marine turbine engine for the old type of piston engine and a new design of gyro steering gear eliminating certain admitted defects of the Obry gear and better adapted for the longer range contemplated.

BLISS-LEAVITT TORPEDO.

Thus began the final stage of the evolution of the present Bliss-Leavitt torpedo now used by our Navy. Years elapsed before ideas and ideals became accomplished facts. Many minds, including naval officers and others, contributed to the final product. In my judgment, however, the highest credit of all is due to Mr. Leavitt and to the officers of the E. W. Bliss Co., who through evil as well as good report, through discouragement and threatened loss, persisted until success crowned their efforts.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit in that connection, will the gentleman explain the principle of the mechanism by which they make what is called a curved shot? Take some vessels that have two tubes and they want to fire one torpedo at a ship over here and another torpedo at a ship over there and they have to set it at a given degree. Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; I shall be glad to explain it at this point in response to the very courteous request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

The first of the new torpedoes completed in 1899 contained an additional feature known as wide-angle fire. This arrangement enables one to shoot around the corner, as it were. The object is to enable the torpedo to be launched in a given direction, and upon its entering the water cause it to turn and run in any other desired direction. The value of this feature lies in the fact that the modern submerged tube can not be trained upon the

target, but is a fixture built into the ship under the water line. Consequently without the angle device, in order to bring the torpedo to bear on the target, it is necessary to maneuver the ship. With it the ship may be held on her course and the torpedo adjusted to turn and run in the desired direction.

To the lay observer these angle shots appear spectacular and somewhat mysterious. In fact, they are quite simple, if you have in mind the principle of the gyroscope. The flywheel is spun up with the axis pointed in the ultimate direction desired. The initial launching force carries the torpedo in the direction in which the launching tube is pointed until the torpedo is clear of the ship. As this force is soon spent, the gyro control asserts itself and the torpedo responds to it by taking and holding the course upon which it is set.

HEATED-AIR CHARGE.

In this experimental torpedo no attempt was made to increase the efficiency through the agency of heat. Experiments in this direction were made with one of the old Whitehead torpedoes, the expense of the experiments being to some extent borne by the Government. Having become convinced by preliminary experiments that the system had merit, the Bliss Co. proposed that one of the Whitehead torpedoes be equipped with the new heating device. It was also agreed that a stated bonus above the contract price should be paid for each knot or fraction of a knot gained in speed due to the action of the heater, and that if no appreciable increase was obtained the company should remove the heating device and make no charge for the experiment. The trials resulted in an increase in speed of 4 or 5 knots at the 800 yards range.

You must remember, however, that naval experts generally were not at that time very enthusiastic advocates of the torpedo as a weapon. Some believed and so advised the Bliss Co. that they were wasting their money. The experiments were very costly and the outlook was so discouraging that for a year or two the matter was allowed to drop.

REAR ADMIRAL FISKE.

There were, however, a few officers of the Navy who took a different view of the matter. Prominent among these was Lieut. Commander Bradley A. Fiske, now rear admiral, retired. It was largely through his persistence that in 1901 an agreement was made between the Navy Department and the Bliss Co. under which the experiments were continued. Under this arrangement another torpedo embodying the heating device and other improvements was ready for trial in 1903. The board of officers conducting the test found "that the turbine torpedo under trial has an average speed of 30.28 knots at 1,200 yards range, which, considering the improvised character of the work and the novelty of many parts, is a remarkable performance."

In 1905 a new and larger type was decided upon having a diameter of 21 inches. The speed and range called for were 26 knots at 3,500 yards, but only 3,000 yards could be attained at the required speed.

While these developments were going on an English firm, Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., undertook to improve upon the heating device and finally succeeded in doing so, thereby adding to the possibilities of both speed and range.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Are all these improvements English and American inventions, and none of them German?

Mr. TILSON. It was, in fact, an Austrian that invented one of the most important features.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gyroscope?

Mr. TILSON. Not the gyroscope, but the application of it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Are these torpedoes the same as the Germans use?

Mr. TILSON. We do not know. We know the Germans used the Whitehead torpedo just the same as we did. We know they were and are working on it with all the ingenuity known to be possessed by that people. We know some of the results they have achieved with it, but they have managed to keep fairly secret just what the type is that they are using now. So far as we can ascertain by the uses to which we see them put, their range and accuracy, and so on, they do not in any way excel what we know we possess.

Gathering up all the improvements to date and all the results of prior experiments, still another torpedo was designed for which contracts were let in 1911. Two types were called for, one of about 18 inches diameter and 17 feet long, the other 21 inches in diameter and 21 feet long. In the latter part of 1911 the two torpedoes were tested. The smaller weapon showed a speed of about 33 knots at 4,000 yards range (since increased to upward of 35 knots) while the larger one covered 10,000 yards at a speed of over 28 knots.

The main factors which have contributed toward bringing torpedo performance up to its present stage may be classified, in the order of their importance, as follows:

First. Superheating of the air charge and the injection of water.

Second. Substitution of the turbine for the old type of piston engine.

Third. Development of a gyro steering gear capable of controlling the torpedo over the longer ranges.

Fourth. Enlargement in the dimensions of the weapon.

Fifth. Improvement in the quality of the steel of which the air flask is constructed, enabling higher air pressure to be carried.

Since the torpedo tests just referred to were made the range has been still farther lengthened and torpedoes of the 21-foot type are now constructed to run at least 12,500 yards. It would be rash to say that the end has been reached. If the fate of empires is to be decided by the performance of this weapon, it is safe to say that the limit of its effectiveness has not been reached.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUSSELL. The United States up to this time has not used any great quantities of these torpedoes, has it?

Mr. TILSON. You mean in this war?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I do not understand they have had opportunity to use very many.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is there a very great quantity of them now being manufactured for probable use during the war?

Mr. TILSON. I understand that there is. In all the criticism we hear everywhere, I have not heard any criticism of the Navy in this regard. It is believed that the officers in charge of the Navy have taken the proper steps in this direction.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is there more than one factory engaged in making them?

Mr. TILSON. As I understand, they are made at the Washington Navy Yard, at the Newport Yard, and by the E. W. Bliss Co., of Brooklyn. I know that the Bliss Co. has considerable capacity.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can you state about the cost of the torpedo when complete and ready for use?

Mr. TILSON. I can state it only approximately, because, as the gentleman knows, prices for material and everything else are changing so that it is impossible to state accurately. They cost anywhere from \$6,000 to \$9,000 or \$10,000 apiece.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the gentleman give any estimate of the additional cost of discharging one?

Mr. TILSON. There is practically no cost of discharging them. This little cartridge [indicating] can discharge one, or a little compressed air.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I want to ask a question in regard to the range. You stated that the maximum range is about 12,500 yards.

Mr. TILSON. I said we had attained a range of 12,500 yards in tests. I am confident we have attained considerably longer range than that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I wanted to inquire if there is any real advantage in such a range as that in view of the difficulty of hitting the mark?

Mr. TILSON. There is. If there should be a convoy, for instance—a convoy that you can fire among—you would be willing to expend even an expensive weapon of this sort in order to take a chance of hitting one of the convoy.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. But doing that at that distance would be a wasteful proposition, would it not, because of the remote chance of hitting?

Mr. TILSON. Well, the torpedo is now so perfect that you feel rather certain of its going where it is aimed. There is no question about that. The only question is to find out just where to aim it; that is, to know at what time the ship you wish to hit will be in a certain place. There is the real difficulty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. TILSON. I thank the gentleman, but I prefer to stop here and thank the Members of the House for their most courteous attention. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, in order to answer the questions of gentlemen when asked, my remarks have

been somewhat disconnected. I therefore ask the privilege of revising, extending, and somewhat rearranging my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9314) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, with Mr. HUMPHREYS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9314) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, on day before yesterday, late in the afternoon, just before adjournment, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], made this statement as it appears in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the benefit of gentlemen who heard the clear and able speech of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] that I called on the State Department a moment ago, and they stated to me, through Mr. Woolsey, the Solicitor, that they had got Mr. HAMLIN's letter of yesterday and immediately took the matter up with the President, and the President had given authority to give Mr. HAMLIN all the information he desired; that they had prepared a letter this morning and sent it down, and it was supposed to be in Mr. HAMLIN's office at the time he was addressing the committee.

That statement is hardly fair to me. Of course, I know that the gentleman from Virginia was simply repeating information that he had got over the phone. However, the statement is not accurate. The truth is that as soon as I finished my remarks I went immediately and directly to my office in this building, and when I got there my secretary informed me that the State Department had just at that moment called up and said they had the information which I wanted ready and were sending it to me. That was around 4 o'clock or later in the afternoon. The information did not reach me until the next morning. It came to me in my mail, brought by the mail messenger.

I only speak of that because I do not want to be put in the attitude of pretending in my remarks on this floor that I had not got the information which I wanted when it might have been in my office at the very time. I repeat that it did not reach my office until the next morning. In fact, when I made that speech I did not know that the department would ever furnish it.

Mr. FLOOD. The statement I made intended to convey the idea that the letter had been sent to the gentleman; not that he had gotten it, but that it probably reached his office after he had taken the floor.

Mr. HAMLIN. Of course the gentleman did not mean to put me in a false light at all. I am quite sure of that. I only wanted to make this statement so as to make the actual facts clear. My somewhat desultory and innocent remarks seem to have been misunderstood in some quarters. I was not leveling criticism at anyone in particular; certainly not at the State Department as at present officered. I was seeking to call attention to the fact that some years ago there had been a practice in the department that I regarded as extremely pernicious and dangerous, that of spending money out of the emergency fund and other funds and covering these expenditures in settlement with the Treasury with these so-called secret certificates, so that the public could not know what this money had been expended for. I expressed the hope in my remarks the other day that when we got the information from the present administration of the State Department we would find that that pernicious practice had been changed. And I think I ought to say right here, in justification of the administration in charge of the department at the time that we made the investigation, the department being at that time presided over by a distinguished gentleman [Mr. Knox] who is now a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, that he, when his attention was called to these

bad practices by our committee, sought to remedy and change the methods so as to put an end to them.

I feel that I ought to make this a little plainer in justice to Mr. Knox and to the party that he represents. There is no politics in this. I spoke of the department expending \$20,000 in 1909 to participate in the Lake Champlain celebration, and then covering those expenditures by these secret certificates, when there was, in fact, no secrecy about it. I have here the hearings that were held by our committee on that question, and I find that we subpoenaed Mr. Secretary Knox and asked him to produce those vouchers. He declined to do so until he got permission from the President. He had us insert in the hearings a letter which he addressed to President Taft calling his attention to our request and asking permission to present the vouchers. In that letter, after detailing to President Taft the facts in regard to the appropriation and expenditure of the \$20,000, he said:

I have been thus detailed in my explanation in order that the entire facts and circumstances might be clearly before you. In my judgment, it was improper to cover the account under section 291, and there was no sufficient reason to make a certificate to the effect that it was not advisable to specify the purpose for which said money was expended. The money was appropriated "for expenses of the proposed celebration." It was a specific appropriation for a specific purpose, and at most and under any proper theory all that it was necessary for the Department of State to ascertain was whether, as a fact, that amount of expenditure had been incurred, which seems to have been carefully ascertained from the vouchers on file. It does not seem to me that the money was expended for foreign intercourse. It was expended to encourage and aid a celebration in the United States of the discovery of a lake, around which were clustered historic memories and associations in which two other nations were concerned, and the fact that the United States extended an invitation for the representatives of these nations to be present did not make it international intercourse within the meaning of the statute. If Congress had indicated in the appropriation that it had appropriated the money for the payment of the expenses of the representatives of Great Britain and France, then to the extent that the appropriation was used for that purpose it probably would have been proper to cover the expenditure under section 291, but you will note that the appropriation as made was for the purpose of paying the expenses of the celebration and not the expenses of the guests invited by the United States, the fact being that the guests invited by the United States, like all other guests who were invited by the local authorities having in charge the celebration, incurred no expense except such as was paid by the celebration authorities themselves, and it was to enable the celebration authorities to pay all the expenses of the celebration that the appropriation was evidently made.

He then asked permission to present the vouchers and that permission was granted by President Taft. When he presented those vouchers to our committee, together with his letter to the President, I, as chairman of the committee, said to him:

Mr. Secretary, I certainly congratulate you upon getting around to our view of this matter.

Secretary KNOX. I had not the slightest hesitation in getting there when I got started.

The CHAIRMAN. We have certainly done some good if we have convinced you that these expenditures should not have been covered by secret certificates under section 291.

Secretary KNOX. There was no excuse for it whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not hesitate to say, speaking for myself, that it was not so much this particular item as it was the principle of the thing for which I have been contending. We felt that you had a practice in the State Department of covering in settlement with the Treasury expenditures out of appropriations that ought not to be covered by certificates under section 291, and it was for the purpose of settling the question as to whether you could legally do that, that you have been called upon to produce these vouchers.

Secretary KNOX. Under the operation of that order no vouchers are passed under section 291 unless they are brought to me in a separate envelope printed on the back in legible type. "These vouchers are for the personal inspection of the Secretary of State," for the purpose of considering whether they are proper to be passed under section 291; they are not brought to me with the mail, and the chief clerk is directed to deliver them to my private secretary with instructions that these are vouchers proposed to be passed under section 281 and are to be handed to me personally, so that I am trying to do everything in my power at least to see that proper practice is followed.

The CHAIRMAN. I am very much obliged to you for that statement, and I will say, furthermore, that I am sure it is not the purpose of this committee to try to get hold of information that we ought not to have; but we had reached the conclusion—some of us at least—as I said awhile ago, that the practice in the State Department had been such that many dollars of the public money was being expended and information in regard to the expenditures denied to Congress and to the public that ought not to be denied to the public. I feel, of course, that Congress being the body that appropriates the money it is entitled to all the information as to how it is expended, and that if there is anything that ought to be kept secret we can keep it as well as anybody else. It will be noted at this point that the vouchers requested have been filed with this committee and are printed as an appendix to this hearing. Your disbursing officer was requested to produce before the subcommittee vouchers showing how the fund given to the State Department in 1906 to pay the expenses of bringing home criminals was expended and he declined to produce those vouchers. I assume that now you take no issue with the proposition that that fund ought not to have been covered by section 291 and would be willing to produce those vouchers?

I think that I ought also to say that Secretary Knox told our committee that he had given orders that not one single dollar should be taken out of the secret fund and expended until every item of the expenditure was specified and laid on his desk and

his attention specifically called to it, so that it could be passed upon by him. That is what I spoke of the other day. I talked to Secretary Bryan, when he took charge of the department, about this same matter, and he told me he would follow the practice outlined by Mr. KNOX. To put a stop to that loose practice has been my only purpose for calling attention to this so frequently for some years past.

I know that the department must have a secret fund that they may expend and not be compelled to account for specifically, but I was astounded to find that they had fallen into the habit some years ago of covering by these secret certificates almost everything they chose and then saying to Congress and everybody else, "Hands off. We will not explain. We do not have to explain."

The other day when I spoke I was unable to give you the information as to the methods followed by the present administration of the State Department, but I am more than pleased to say now that in the statement which they have furnished me for the years 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917, inclusive, and which I did not have the other day, they have kept separate the amount of money that they have expended for purely secret purposes, the expenditure for which has been covered in settlement with the Treasury by secret certificates, and the amount that they have expended from this fund that they have accounted for in the ordinary and usual way by filing vouchers, as all the other departments do, and can be seen by anyone interested. So I think there can be no criticism, I am glad to say, of the department since Mr. KNOX issued that order up to and until the present time. And I am hoping, with this matter being again called to their attention, the bad practice about which I have complained will never again prevail.

Mr. DENISON. How can the gentleman tell whether there could be any criticism unless he knows what is in those secret vouchers? Of course he must assume that those expenditures were proper.

Mr. HAMLIN. Of course, we have always got to assume that; but what I was specially emphasizing is that prior to the time when we made this investigation and called the attention of the department to this bad practice they never made any separation of the expenditures. They covered all that suited their convenience best by secret certificates under section 291, Revised Statutes. Now they are not doing that, I am glad to say.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If when peace is concluded we are to have no more secret diplomacy, can the gentleman think of any reason which would justify, in time of peace, the keeping secret of the purposes for which the public moneys are expended—any purpose whatever?

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not hesitate to answer that I think the necessity for that in time of peace is extremely small, and that is why our committee recommended that the appropriation for this fund, some years ago when we were at peace with the world, be cut down from \$90,000, the ordinary amount, to \$50,000. It seemed to us that that was quite sufficient to meet any unforeseen emergency in times of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman said he was going to ask to extend something in the RECORD. I want to ask him a question in connection with that before leave is granted.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman what he proposes to extend in the RECORD?

Mr. HAMLIN. I am willing to put in, and glad to put in, among other things, the order issued by Mr. KNOX in relation to the handling of this fund. It is as follows:

REGULATIONS GOVERNING EXPENDITURES FROM THE APPROPRIATION FOR "UNFORESEEN EMERGENCIES ARISING IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE, AND TO EXTEND THE COMMERCIAL AND OTHER INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES."

1. Expenditures from the appropriation for emergencies will be made solely upon written authorizations signed by the President or by the Secretary of State, or, in his absence, by the Acting Secretary of State, in all cases prior to the making of an expenditure or the issuing of any instruction placing a charge upon the appropriation.

2. All authorizations when submitted for signature shall set forth, except as hereinafter ordered to the contrary, (1) the purpose of the expenditure; (2) the rate of compensation if for services; (3) the period of employment or expenditure, if for a fixed term, or, when not definitely known, the approximate term; (4) the total charge to be made against the appropriation, if it can be ascertained, and if not, an approximate

estimate; (5) the available balance of the appropriation at the time of authorization (the balance to be inserted in the authorization by the Chief of the Bureau of Accounts over his initials prior to the signing of the authorization by the Secretary of State).

3. Persons traveling or on special detail in connection with the objects of the appropriation, whose accounts are payable from the appropriation, shall receive reimbursement for actual, reasonable, and necessary expenses in addition to their regular compensation provided by law or regulation. Persons not in the employ of the Government may be given a stipulated rate of compensation and actual and necessary expenses, or a per diem in lieu of compensation and expenses according to the direction of the President or the Secretary of State in each case. A per diem allowance for expenses in addition to salary provided by law is prohibited. A copy of the appointment, designation, or contract in each case must be annexed to the account when submitted for approval.

4. The disbursement of moneys from the appropriation shall ordinarily be made by check, but cash payment may be made in those cases authorized by Treasury Regulations when the payment is made by the disbursing officer in person or by his deputy and the exchange of money and the receipt therefor is simultaneous.

5. When for any reason the President or the Secretary of State may deem it inexpedient in the public interest to make known the purpose or manner of a proposed expenditure from the appropriation, the authorization will be so drawn for the amount stipulated and the money will be paid over to the President or the Secretary of State upon the execution of a receipt therefor, which shall be filed as a voucher.

6. When presented for approval, all accounts for moneys chargeable to the appropriation shall have attached thereto the authorization in each case, and shall be itemized and supported by vouchers according to the usual practice required by law and the regulations of the Comptroller of the Treasury, except in cases where from the nature and method of the expenditure it is impracticable or inexpedient in the public interest to do so, and in such cases the personal certificate of the person expending the money may be accepted in lieu of vouchers in support of the account, when approved by the Secretary of State.

7. All accounts for moneys payable from the appropriation for emergencies that are not of a confidential nature shall be settled with the accounting officers of the Treasury by submitting the original paid vouchers in the same manner as expenditures from other appropriations, but such as may be considered confidential will be settled upon a certificate signed by the Secretary of State, or in his absence by the Acting Secretary of State, under section 291 of the Revised Statutes.

8. All authorizations, accounts, and certificates relating to the appropriation for emergencies shall be presented for the signature of the Secretary or Acting Secretary of State through the Director of the Consular Service or such other officer as shall have been designated by the Secretary of State to supervise the finances of the department.

9. The authorizations given shall be numbered and filed numerically by the Bureau of Accounts and separate from the paid voucher, the number and date of each authorization being noted upon the account to which it relates.

10. All correspondence in relation to expenditures from the appropriation for emergencies shall be signed by the Secretary of State, or in his absence by the Acting Secretary of State.

These regulations will become effective on and after June 15, 1911.

P. C. KNOX.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 1, 1911.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. KNOX was then Secretary of State?

Mr. HAMLIN. He was then Secretary of State. I thought it was due to Secretary KNOX to make this statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Secretary KNOX came before your committee and stated his disapproval of the system to which you have referred?

Mr. HAMLIN. He came before our committee in obedience to a subpoena issued to him, and after we had gone over this matter he agreed that we were right about it, and thanked us for calling attention to the practice and issued this order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then it was Secretary KNOX who coincided with the gentleman's view on secret expenses?

Mr. HAMLIN. Absolutely.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When the gentleman addressed the House day before yesterday he inserted a letter from Secretary Lansing, in which Secretary Lansing told your committee that he could not give you the information desired until he had conferred with the President, thus continuing the practice to which the gentleman objects.

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] must understand that the thing to which I have so long been objecting to was the manner of accounting for the expenditure of this money, and that is the thing on which Mr. KNOX and I seemed to agree. I did think the other day, and I am still of the same opinion, that the present Secretary was not justified in his attitude toward my request, for I asked not for the items for which the secret fund was expended but only for the amount expended each year. This could not be confidential.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I compliment the gentleman for what he has done. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour and a half to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, can we not have tellers?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia can move that the committee rise.

Mr. FLOOD. I understand that the bell will be rung when we call for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia can move that the committee rise.

Mr. FLOOD. I withdraw my demand, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SWIFT] makes the point of no quorum. Eighty-four Members present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Boehrer | Fairchild, B. L. | Key, Ohio | Robinson |
| Britten | Fairchild, G. W. | Kiess, Pa. | Rodenberg |
| Butler | Flynn | Kreider | Rowland |
| Caldwell | Focht | LaGuardia | Russell |
| Campbell, Kans. | Fuller, Mass. | Lazaro | Sanders, La. |
| Campbell, Pa. | Gallagher | Lee, Cal. | Sanders, N. Y. |
| Candler, Miss. | Gard | Lee, Ga. | Saunders, Va. |
| Cannon | Garland | Lobeck | Schall |
| Capstick | Godwin, N. C. | McCormick | Scott, Pa. |
| Carlin | Goodall | McCulloch | Scully |
| Carter, Mass. | Gregg | McKinley | Shackelford |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Hamill | Maher | Sherley |
| Copley | Hamilton, N. Y. | Mann | Smith, T. F. |
| Costello | Haskell | Martin | Steagall |
| Crago | Hayes | Mondell | Stedman |
| Crosser | Heintz | Montague | Stiness |
| Curry, Cal. | Hollingsworth | Nicholls, S. C. | Sullivan |
| Dale, N. Y. | Houston | Olney | Templeton |
| Davidson | Hull, Iowa | O'Shaunessy | Vare |
| Dempsey | Husted | Polk | Watson, Pa. |
| Dewalt | Johnson, Ky. | Porter | Wilson, La. |
| Doelling | Johnson, S. Dak. | Powers | Winslow |
| Doughton | Johnson, Wash. | Price | Wright |
| Drukker | Jones, Va. | Ragsdale | Zihlman |
| Dunn | Kahn | Ramsey | |
| Edmonds | Keating | Randall | |
| Estopinal | Kelley, Mich. | Riordan | |

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. HUMPHREYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 9314, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, finding itself without a quorum, had caused the roll to be called, when 323 Members answered to their names, and he presented a list of the absentees.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield one hour and a half to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Chairman, may I not, at the outset of what I shall presently say, appeal to the record of 16 years' service in the House to attest the assertion that I have never in all that time sought occasion nor availed myself of the privilege to speak here on any topic with the consideration of which I was not specially charged by reason of committee assignments? And now, when I am about to deviate momentarily from the rule, I would very sincerely regret to have it supposed for one minute that it was with any degree of eagerness that I reached the conclusion to address myself to-day to a subject with which many of my colleagues have much greater familiarity; but in which, I may venture to hope, no Member has a keener or more imperative interest. Indeed, it is a problem which comes home to the bosom of every American citizen, and while some Members of the Congress, by reason of long and intimate association with military affairs, are mentally trained in the technique and terminology and intricate details of our war-making establishment, and will, at an appropriate time, present and elucidate for us the things which we shall be asked to consider and approve, there are, nevertheless, some matters of such common knowledge and general concern that any of us might feel warranted in discussing them. It is a thing of this description that has recently arrested the attention of the country and it is upon this I am constrained to talk.

On the 19th day of January the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate made an address in New York City before an association called the National Security League, and among the deductions presented to the assembled audience, amid manifestations of applause, was that contained in the remarkable declaration that—

the Military Establishment of America has fallen down. There is no use to be optimistic about a thing that does not exist. It has almost stopped functioning, my friends. Why? Because of inefficiency in every bureau and in every department of the Government of the United States.

LIKE A FIRE BELL AT NIGHT.

Mr. Chairman, the country was agast at that terrific impeachment of the Government of the United States. It was a passionate, a comprehensive, arraignment; and, coming from such a source in such circumstances, it startled the nervous system of the Nation as the clanging of a fire bell in the night. Instantly public interest became tense. Immediately it was realized that

the Oregon Senator in that New York speech had done what Edmund Burke said he could not do; he had drawn an indictment of a whole people. I say the Oregon Senator had indicted a whole people, Mr. Chairman, because this is a representative Government, equally free from the impedimenta of heredity and the constraints of autocratic power. And if it truthfully may be said that the American people have erected a Government that fails to function in the face of imminent peril, what more accursed accusation could be written in the book of fate? If, with good reason, it may be charged that the people of the United States, with their constitutional freedom of speech and of the press, have been so indifferent to their liberties and so insensible of their own security as to commit "every bureau and department of Government" to incompetent hands, would we not better welcome, rather than resist, the invasion of Teutonic culture? If what Senator CHAMBERLAIN said at New York is true, it denotes the irretrievable breakdown of democracy at a time when only the triumph of democracy in arms may compensate for the glorious oblation of men who have died and men who yet shall perish that heaven may be kind to those who hereafter will inhabit the earth. [Applause.]

ASPERITY! YES.

Was any Member of the Congress surprised that the President of the United States pursued the unconventional course of making swift and direct answer through the medium of the public press? I think the country would have been pained and disappointed had not the President, charged with the administration of the Government and the conduct of the war, taken the quickest way to reassure the American people. It was a grave situation that the Oregon Senator had created, one which could not endure hesitation or fine phrasing; and I venture to think the President met the exigency in pretty good degree. Asperity! Yes; there was asperity; but, Mr. Chairman, there come occasions when benignity itself is challenged to aid the right by assuming an aspect of reproof.

The President characterized the extraordinary indictment of the Government by the Oregon Senator as a distinct "distortion of the truth," and for convenient reference I shall here append the statement from the White House:

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN's statement as to the present inaction and ineffectiveness of the Government is an astonishing and absolutely unjustifiable distortion of the truth.

As a matter of fact, the War Department has performed a task of unparalleled magnitude and difficulty with extraordinary promptness and efficiency.

There have been delays and disappointments and partial miscarriages of plans, all of which have been drawn into the foreground and exaggerated by the investigations which have been in progress since the Congress assembled—investigations which drew indispensable officials of the department constantly away from their work and officers from their commands and contributed a great deal to such delay and confusion as has inevitably arisen. But by comparison with what has been accomplished, these things, much as they are to be regretted, were insignificant, and no mistake has been made which has been repeated.

Nothing helpful or likely to speed or facilitate the war tasks of the Government has come out of such criticism and investigation—I have not been consulted about them, and have learned of them only at second hand—but their proposal came after effective measures of reorganization had been thoughtfully and maturely perfected, and inasmuch as these measures have been the result of experience, they are much more likely than any others to be effective, if the Congress will but remove a few statutory obstacles of rigid departmental organization which stand in their way.

The legislative proposals I have heard of would involve long additional delays and turn our experience into mere lost motion.

My association and constant conference with the Secretary of War have taught me to regard him as one of the ablest public officials I have ever known. The country will soon learn whether he or his critics understand the business in hand.

To add, as Senator CHAMBERLAIN did, that there is inefficiency in every department and bureau of the Government is to show such ignorance of actual conditions as to make it impossible to attach any importance to his statement.

I am bound to infer that that statement sprang out of opposition to the administration's whole policy rather than out of any serious intention to reform its practice.

A GROSS PROVOCATION.

That is a distressing thing to be said by a man of exalted station about the utterances of a man of a little less distinguished rank. It is a condemnation in tenor and terms that may be justified, in propriety or in fact, only by the extremity of the offense and the indubitable necessity of drastic treatment. In this case was not the provocation inconceivably gross? Did not the sweeping charge of the Oregon Senator asperse indiscriminately the integrity of the administrative officials of the Government and invite popular suspicion and discontent? Was it not, indeed, calculated to create alarm among the timid everywhere and defection even among the stout of heart who should very naturally impute to the speaker intimate knowledge of every detail in the sum of military preparation?

I can not say how the incident impressed other Members of the Congress, but I certainly experienced at first a feeling akin to personal affliction that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, without warning or apparent justification of any kind, amid the felicitations and applause of adversary revilers and critics, should thus have bitterly assailed an administration of which he was a part, and, without distinction, have mercilessly pilloried as wretched incompetents grim veterans of the American Army who have spent their lives and expended their energies in the service of the country! [Applause.] And, Mr. Chairman, when an earnest quest for the truth carried me painstakingly to the end of nearly 2,000 pages of responsible testimony only to find revealed the utter insufficiency of proof to sustain the astounding censure distress gave place to amazement, and I wondered whether anything the President or anybody else could have said in resentment would have more aptly depicted the episode than what the President actually did say.

THE RECORD RIGHT.

We have been asked to search the record, Mr. Chairman, and it is to the record that I appeal. I have seen it with mine own eyes and with mine own ears have heard it expounded. From the testimony I have turned away, not with tears nor with trembling apprehension for the well-being of my own sons or the sons of other fathers, but with a firmer faith in my country, praising God for the quiet courage of the men and the ineffable fortitude of the women of America who are to win this war. [Applause.] And for those who impeach their fidelity and deride their capabilities and seek to decry or obscure their achievements we should invoke the imprecations of every loyal citizen. [Applause.]

"VICIOUS PATHOS."

Were every specification marshaled by the critics of the Government really founded in fact, all of them taken together would not exalt the offense of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S New York indictment. The incontestable facts do not at all justify his conclusions, but he must have recourse to utterly hostile inferences. Take the criticisms, for example, directed against the Ordnance Bureau with respect to artillery supply. The Government is blamed for an alleged shortage of guns and bitterly reproached for its momentary dependence upon our allies in the war. The criticism assumes the guise of pathos when it is said that our own impotency necessitated an appeal to poor, bleeding France for assistance. The United States, we are asked to believe, presents to the world the humiliating spectacle of taking from the depleted stock of a struggling comrade nation! But, Mr. Speaker, the pathos of the illustration but intensifies the vice of it. Who of us is not familiar with the facts? What Member of the Congress does not very definitely know that France is furnishing the American Army with guns, not because we sought to deplete her "meager stores" but because her chosen ambassadors and picked experts asked the privilege of arming our expeditionary force from her oversupplied arsenals. [Applause.] It was the wise thing for France to have proposed and the only effective thing for America to have done. [Applause.]

JOFFRE CALLED TO WITNESS.

Many of my colleagues will distinctly recall the memorable evening spent by some of us at the home, in this city, of an ambassador to France when we had the privilege of hearing the accredited military and naval representatives of the French Government describe the situation and tell us what it was necessary for this Government to do. Marshal Joffre, for the army, and the French admiral, for the navy, talked to that company of Congressmen for three hours, telling them, cautiously, of course, what at the moment the finest experts of France were pointing out in elaborate detail to every important bureau of the American War Department. Placidly, and with characteristic military precision, Marshal Joffre warned against the folly of hurriedly attempting to throw into France an army of untrained and untested American troops. He pointed out how such a thing would violently disrupt trans-Atlantic traffic; how ships thus would be used which might more profitably be devoted to the transportation of necessary munitions and other supplies to the armies of the allies; how futile and inoperative an untrained army would be in France; how necessarily ignorant even our Regular Army was of modern instrumentalities of war, the character of which was changing even as the war raged. Warfare had been literally revolutionized since the Battle of the Marne, and by those who knew we had to be told the things that we did not know. All through the French marshal's talk there ran a particular thought as a thread through a woven garment; and that was the warning against heedless haste. It was suggested that but a single division of the best trained troops of the Regular Army should be then sent to France, with a complement of Artillery. This division was there to be divided into two divisions of the French strength for intensive training behind the lines of battle, to be

prepared later to train intensively the American troops that should follow. It had not been the plan of our General Staff to send over troops so early. It had taken Great Britain two years to prepare an effective army. But the representatives of the French Government stressed the point that the presence of this small expeditionary force would heighten the spirit of France and correspondingly depress the morale of the adversary. And, oh, how true one part of this at least turned out to be.

The Secretary of War on last Monday told the pathetic story in his masterly statement before the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate. Said he:

The people of France kissed the hems of their garments as they marched up the streets of Paris; the old veterans, wounded in this war, legless or armless, stumping along on crutches, perhaps, as they went up the streets of Paris with their arms around the necks of the American soldiers. Not a single man in that division was unaccompanied by a veteran. America had gone to France, and the French people rose with a sense of gratitude and hopefulness that had never been in them before.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in order to send even this contingent of troops from our pitiful little American Army it was essential to be assured of guns; and when it was suggested to Marshal Joffre that, having just entered the war, we had not immediate equipment, it was promptly replied that France had an overabundance; that her munition factories had caught up and exceeded the necessities of the French Army; that the gun wastage could not keep her arsenals to capacity; and that France could easily and would gladly supply the American expeditionary force. Marshal Joffre even suggested that this were better done by French than by American factories, since it would save the unavoidable delays, the pressingly needed cargo space, the tremendous cost of shipment, and other things which I do not now recall.

WAS CHAMBERLAIN IGNORANT?

Is it possible that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate did not come in contact with the French mission to this country and did not learn from the accredited agents of France the facts which I have here cited? Is it possible that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN was not advised of the testimony of Gen. Crozier before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, in which the Chief of Ordnance, more explicitly than I could hope to do, presented these very facts in evidence to show the reason why France and Great Britain are supplying guns to our Army abroad? Is it because he was ignorant of these facts that he sought to have the country believe our Military Establishment is a myth? Is it because of gross ignorance of the truth that critics bemoan a condition which, in the circumstances, any discerning man must see is of tremendous advantage to France as well as to America? I hope it is ignorance, Mr. Chairman, because I would not like to shock my own imagination with the thought that any adversary of the Government is malevolent enough perversely to employ the fine sympathy of the American people for France in a prejudicial assault on the American Government. Yes; both France and Great Britain are supplying the American Army with guns; we are buying them and paying for them just as France and Great Britain bought munitions from us when they could not get them quickly enough or in sufficient quantities from their own factories. And the fact does not constitute an indictment of this Government. Rather is it a clear index of the purpose and a hopeful sign of the diligence which the War Department is applying to the situation. That the arrangement has worked well is convincingly evidenced by the fact that France and Great Britain have proposed its continuation for the current year, and Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, Chief of Staff of the American Army, has recommended such an agreement to this Government. This does not imply any abatement of our activities in this country, for we have already placed orders totaling \$1,600,000,000.

THE ARMY SUPPLIED WITH ARTILLERY.

From it all we may deduce the comforting assurance that the War Department is more concerned to furnish the American Army in France with modern guns with which to train and fight than it is to haggle with ambitious statesmen over the source of supply. The thing which will most interest the American people and from which they will derive the greatest satisfaction is the fact that their Army on the battle front has modern guns—among the best in the world—guns that will destroy the enemy. This being the case, perhaps they may be persuaded to forgive the Secretary of War for getting these guns in the quickest possible way, at the least possible cost to the Government of the United States, with the least possible disturbance of the plans of the allied nations. And merely because the Secretary of War and his expert military advisers thus used their plain common sense in a perplexing posture of affairs, it is not to be inferred that the Congress of the United

States or the people of the country will be induced to credit the wild and foolish charge that the Government has broken down and needs to be frightened to its feet again by the distempered clatter of theatrical public men. [Applause.]

FRENCH OVERPLUS OF ARMS.

Here I shall put in the RECORD a statement by André Tardieu, former French high commissioner, now munition minister of France, showing conclusively how France welcomed the arrangements:

An important agreement has been concluded between the United States Government and the French high commissioner, M. André Tardieu.

According to said agreement the American Government adopts the two principal pieces of matériel of French artillery, the 75 millimeter field gun and the 155 millimeter rapid-fire howitzer.

The expeditionary corps of Gen. Pershing has received from the French authorities, on arrival, its field artillery, its rapid-fire heavy artillery, and its French artillery—which, of course, will accelerate its taking its place in the line.

At the same time the artillery production in France and in America has been organized so that the American Army of 1,000,000 men which is about to be recruited will receive without delay, as the units are formed, the necessary heavy and light guns.

The negotiations taken up for the first time at the end of May, between M. André Tardieu, French high commissioner; M. Ganne, Chief of war munitions of the high commission; and Brig. Gen. Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, were characterized by two ideas.

On one hand the American Government wished to adopt the quickest solution, in order to realize in the shortest time the complete armament of its forces.

On the other hand, with great foresight they attached particular importance to realizing, for the American and the French Armies, called to fight on the same battle fields, uniformity of munitions, of such capital importance from a tactical point of view.

In view of these two desired aims, the French high commissioner was able, thanks to the development since 1916 of the machine equipment of our war munitions factories, to furnish Gen. Crozier with a detailed plan of industrial collaboration, which, by the united efforts of the French and American industries, will assure the complete realization of the American program.

The double certainty of rapid production and uniformity of munitions decided the United States Government, despite the incontestable value of its own matériel, especially that of the 3-inch field gun, of which the superior qualities are universally recognized, to adopt our 75 and our short 155.

The negotiations on these lines were rapidly completed; at the end of somewhat over one month they were concluded this week by a complete understanding, fixing the quantity and the price of the matériel to be furnished.

This understanding, susceptible of important further developments, is a precious proof of the esteem in which the most powerful industrial country of the world holds our engineers and our mechanical constructors. It has also a practical bearing of great value.

From the military point of view it is evident that uniformity of type of guns and munitions for armies fighting on the same battle fields is an appreciable guaranty of safety and efficiency. The supply and the volume of fire are thereby equally facilitated. Unity results spontaneously from identity of weapons. Finally all tactical results, obtained by the experience of three years of war, are without previous adaptation assimilated by the American Army.

From the industrial viewpoint the unity of effort created between the manufacturing plants of the two countries will produce happy results without precedent, not only during the war but also subsequently. Common action provides the best means of mutual acquaintance and for preparation of the close cooperation which it is desired to organize for the future.

From the financial standpoint it is possible to hope that the purchase by the United States of French artillery matériel will create an improvement in exchange, which under the existing relations of America and her European allies is as much to be desired by the United States as by France.

It is also likely that the adoption of the metric system, which has been officially requested by the American Bureau of Standards and which is much to be desired from the point of view of future Franco-American interests, may be thereby facilitated.

These are, briefly stated, some of the results, certain or probable of the agreement between the French high commissioner and the American Government.

The dominant note of the agreement lies in the proof it gives of the unshakable resolution of the American Government to achieve in the shortest time the maximum of military strength, and on the other hand it proves the intimate and active cooperation existing between the United States and France.

Mr. Baker, Secretary of War, and Gen. Crozier, Chief of Ordnance of the American Government, have given proof in this case of the broadest spirit of comprehension and decision and have succeeded in a few weeks in securing for the American troops artillery of the first order.

Our high commissioner at Washington speaks in unbounded praise of their cooperation with him.

MACHINE-GUN SQUABBLE.

Mr. Chairman, in support of the intemperate charge that the Military Establishment of the United States Government is a myth—that it has no existence—a charge contemptuously echoed only the other day by a German military expert in a German newspaper, the controversy over the Lewis machine gun and the Browning gun is revived, and in the very obvious attempt to discredit the Government and to “get Baker” the critics try desperately to convict the Ordnance Bureau of incapacity and the Chief of Ordnance of personal venom. I addressed myself to an examination of the evidence deeply prejudiced against Gen. Crozier; but there is not one particle of disinterested testimony in the hearings which does not abundantly acquit the Chief of Ordnance of blame. The final decision of the competi-

tive tests between the two types of machine gun was delayed—the critics say inordinately delayed—but Gen. Crozier asserted, and the Secretary of War cheerfully assented, that the latter had full responsibility for the fact, so that the persistent contention that the personal pique of the Chief Ordnance Officer of the Government was responsible for the rejection of a superior gun, immediately available, has no evidence to sustain it. Moreover, the Lewis gun was not a superior gun. The preponderance of expert testimony to the superiority of the Browning gun for American use is overwhelming, and it is upon this fact that the Secretary of War relies to justify his opinion that the delay which was occasioned will be more than compensated by the superiority of the weapon secured.

The best experts are definite and emphatic in their judgment that the Browning is “the best machine gun in the world.” The only prop on which the critics seek now to rest their case is the plea that the Lewis gun was immediately available, while deliveries of the Browning gun will be delayed; and they use this broken reed in face of expert testimony to the effect that in tests the Lewis gun “had utterly failed with American ammunition,” which has tremendously greater pressure than British ammunition, and in face of the further fact that the Lewis gun was neither immediately obtainable nor remotely available for our operations in France. Indeed, Gen. Pershing sent word from Europe that the Lewis gun could not be used on his front for land fighting, and even the United States marines who went to France armed with this gun were rearmed with a different weapon.

But this is not important, Mr. Chairman, and the farthest thing from my thought is any desire to transfer the rival gun controversy to this Chamber. I pretend to no knowledge of machine guns. The whole point of what I am saying goes to establishing the fact that the Ordnance Bureau of the Government can not be discredited, even in this single detail, when we balance the testimony of experts against the self-interest of disappointed persons and the miserable bias of fretful politicians with a case to make out. One of the ablest arms manufacturers in the United States pronounced Browning as “probably the most remarkable gunmaker in the world,” and expressed the belief that this opinion was shared “by every gun manufacturer in the world.” So this is the kind of gun and the character of gunmaker with which and whom the Secretary of War dealt.

PERVERTING THE TRUTH.

Ah, but, they say, the testimony reveals that but nine Browning machine guns have been made, and the impression has gone abroad that the American Army has but nine machine guns to go up against the millions of Germany. Talleyrand tells us that language was invented to conceal our thoughts. I should hate to regard that as axiomatic. It is, of course, a witty French cynicism. But, at least, we do know that sometimes words are used to obscure the truth or skillfully employed to pervert it. The American Army in France has thousands of machine guns to go up against the enemy [applause]; it is as well equipped with machine guns as any army in Europe [applause]—perhaps better equipped than the German Army. And no set of malcontents should be permitted to deceive the people of this country into the disturbing supposition that our fighting forces in France are suffering in equipment of any kind. [Applause.]

On this very point Gen. Crozier said nearly two months prior to that extraordinary New York speech to which I have been referring:

I think here is the time to say something which I have not told the committee before in reference to these machine guns. Our number is so small, and the possibility of manufacture in this country was so limited, that when our troops went abroad we made, and were fortunately able to make, the same kind of an arrangement with the French Government with reference to the machine guns that we had made with reference to artillery, and we are getting from them quite a sufficient number of guns to arm our troops over there with the Hotchkiss type of the heavy gun and of the Chauchat type of the light guns.

ITCHING TO “GET BAKER.”

All this rancorous outcry apparently has its root, Mr. Chairman, in the itching desire to “get Baker.” But it can not be done [applause], for the available expert testimony clearly indicates the discernment of the War Secretary. I venture to assert that no civilian could have been got in this country who, as head of the War Department in this emergency, could have exhibited a broader comprehension of policies or better have absorbed the multitude of details than Newton D. Baker. [Great applause.] It is absolutely convincing that delay, if any, occasioned by the retrieval of machine guns and the selection of the Browning is much more than made up by the vastly superior qualities of the gun accepted. Talk to the contrary is mere inference—attenuated inference, amateur inference. It was not expected that deliveries of the Browning gun could be made before this spring, when they will be made in

ample time and quantities to supply our troops as they go abroad. It is by no means clear that haste could have been made had the department accepted the inferior gun; for every available American factory, when we entered the war, was crowded with contract work for foreign governments which engaged its output until past the date of the Browning gun decision. Experienced arms manufacturers insistently declared that no ultimate delay was involved in the discretion exercised by the Secretary of War under the advice of an Army board of high officers. And, aside from all this catching at pegs, the Secretary of War has pointed out that, owing to the decision, "for cogent reasons," to have the American troops cooperate with the French instead of the British the Lewis gun was not adapted for use by our land forces abroad. No such machine gun as the Lewis gun is used by the French and, as stated by the Secretary of War, it is "highly desirable, for military reasons, that the American Army should be organized and equipped as the French Army is organized and equipped." For aviation use and for training purposes, the Lewis gun has been ordered to the practical limit of available funds and is being made to the full increased capacity of the arms plant executing the contract. But, Mr. Chairman, the thing that can not too frequently be stressed—the real thing that the American people should know and will be glad to find out when we brush away the gossamer of excited declamation—is the solid fact so definitely stated by the Secretary of War last Tuesday, when he said:

All our units going to France will be completely equipped with what is taken with them and what is secured by them in France, and the organizations in training camps in this country will be supplied with sufficient weapons to acquire familiarity with them before going abroad.

In short, Mr. Chairman, all American troops in France are fully equipped, every unit going to France will be completely equipped, and every organization in training for France will have sufficient guns before going abroad to acquaint it with their use. That is the testimony; and over against it, on a stage set for the purpose, we have only the agitated exclamation of one public man that the American Military Establishment is a myth. [Applause.]

ARMY HAS FINEST RIFLES IN WORLD.

And they bring up the old rifle dispute, Mr. Chairman, and hang a complaint on that peg by seeking to have it appear that the Army experts did not know their business. Men like Scott, Chief of Staff at the time; Bliss, next in rank; Crozier, Chief of Ordnance; Kuhne, of the War College; Pershing, on his way to France, were unsafe advisers to the Secretary of War! They agreed without a single dissent, after a survey of the whole situation, to use the American Springfield rifle and, in conjunction with it, the English Enfield adjusted to American ammunition and modified as to the interchangeability of parts. It was also the unanimous recommendation of the arms manufacturers' experts. Of course, the change in the Enfield rifle took time; but, meanwhile, with 600,000 Springfield and 165,000 Krags in hand, the Army heads and experts judged that we could better endure the delay than to send our soldiers to France with a rifle dangerously defective—a weapon which Great Britain itself was arranging to radically alter when suddenly overtaken by war and which has been used chiefly for training purposes since the war began. It seems to be the idea of some distinguished gentlemen that we should have grabbed up any old instruments of warfare and sent a ragamuffin army across the Atlantic instantly to break the Hindenburg line. [Laughter.] They did not want us to have modern rifles, nor did they want us to have the best machine gun in the world. Their impatience ran away with their discretion.

I could wish every Member of the House would read the hearings on this point, that they might comprehend the question from the clear, cogent, conclusive reasoning of men of vision, men of great affairs, men of technical understanding, who know what they talk about when they talk. There was S. M. Vauclain, vice president of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, now a member of the Council of National Defense and chairman of the war industries board. I believe you know him, Mr. Speaker; I think he said you induced him to come to Washington. At all events, he is a manufacturer of long experience and a man of great ability, described at the hearings by Senator FREELINGHUYSEN as the real "driving force" in providing artillery and munitions. It is exhilarating to note his intimate knowledge of what is transpiring and to observe how sharply and completely he routed pertinacious critics of War Department operations.

NO APPRECIABLE DELAY.

On this rifle modification matter and the consequent delay charged, Mr. Vauclain was very explicit. He said:

I consider that the Ordnance Bureau was very wise in taking time to perfect this rifle. I think it is the finest rifle made to-day. I think it is a better rifle than the Springfield.

And, briefly explaining advantages of the change from the Enfield model, he said:

There is a great objection to using the rim cartridge in the field on account of jamming when you are working the shot in a rifle. These rifles now have rimless cartridges, the same as used by the Springfield rifle, interchangeable ammunition, absolutely no possibility of jamming in service. Their interchangeability is such that when we were putting English rifles together, if a man put 20 rifles a day together he thought he had done a good day's work. About 10 days ago one of our fitters put 128 of these rifles together, and 97 per cent of them targeted first shot. If this rifle was not of perfect design and perfectly made as to tolerance, it would be impossible for anybody to put 128 rifles together in 10 hours out of a miscellaneous heap of parts; so that I am satisfied that the rifles are an absolutely interchangeable piece of work.

Here I may add that the deliveries of these new model Enfields for the week ending February 2 were 42,932 and of the Springfields 7,900. And yet these hypercritics tell the country the Ordnance Bureau does not exist any longer.

Frustrated in the obvious desire to prove the inadvisability of the change from the technical viewpoint and "hell bent" on making out a case of disastrous delay, one of the hostile critics of the War Department asked Mr. Vauclain how many rifles would have been produced had there been no change of model, to which the witness made the heartbreaking response, "Not one more than we have to-day." And again and again this great captain of industry, this "driving power" of the Government's artillery and munitions force, vindicated the efficiency of the Ordnance Bureau and confounded his inquisitors.

DRILLING RIFLES.

But it is contended that some of the cantonments had not rifles enough with which to train. Gen. Crozier, as I recall, contests this proposition. The Secretary of War was disposed to concede that there was unavoidable delay in deliveries, which had been corrected, however, or was in process of immediate adjustment when Mr. CHAMBERLAIN made his fierce attack on the Government by charging that the Military Establishment had ceased to function.

Gen. Crozier in his testimony pointed out that while every man in every camp had not been furnished a rifle, it is not customary for all the men to drill at the same time, and that, for training purposes, rifles could be used over and over again. Of course there was inconvenience. We should have witnessed a miracle had there not been minor troubles and delays of this sort. But would anybody who hears me be willing to say that an inconvenience of this kind, already subjected to remedial attention, could justify the chairman of a great military committee of the Congress in charging before a public audience an utter breakdown of our Military Establishment? Who of us does not recall that the pictorial papers and magazines of this country for many months after Great Britain had gone to war teemed with illustrations portraying British recruits marching in silk hats, in shirt sleeves, and workman's blouse, and drilling on England's commons with broomsticks and walking canes? Did any responsible public man in Great Britain, because of this, charge that the British military establishment was nonexistent? Mr. Chairman, did the fact here cited betoken incompetence or slothful pace? On the contrary, it seems to me that it signified an indomitable spirit—a spirit that found expression at Neu-chapelle and Passchendaele and other battle fields which will literally crowd the glorious pages of history. And I apprehend that the American people will not be dismayed nor agitated nor made afraid merely because at some camps some recruits were a little while without rifles. Many things are required to make a soldier before putting a rifle in his hands, and we would better have been a few weeks without rifles than without men to train in the other minute and movements of war.

WHAT THE TRUTH REVEALS.

What the American people will desire to know, and what these hostile critics of the Government have been unwilling to tell them, but what the testimony itself abundantly reveals, is that no appreciable time, after our declaration of war, was lost in turning out rifles for the American Army. The people should know that, weeks before Mr. CHAMBERLAIN made his monstrous indictment of his Government, Gen. Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, repeatedly testified before the Military Committees of Congress that "no American troops are being sent to France who have not had rifles which they have been using for some time" prior to sailing. Again he testified that "the troops which thus far have gone to France, and those which will for some time go, are those of the Regular Army and National Guard," for a long time supplied with Springfield rifles for target practice; and then again, with earnestness and emphasis that are perfectly manifest, Gen. Crozier declared on the witness stand:

I wish to say to you that no United States soldier has been or will be delayed five minutes in reaching the theater of war because of the absence of modern rifles.

THE REASON FOR UNPREPAREDNESS.

But, Mr. Chairman, I earnestly invite the attention of the House to this point: Backed by an incontrovertible record of events, I assert that if there was a shortage of modern rifles, or even of dangerously defective weapons, the responsibility is not with the Bureau of Ordnance. I have read in the papers that somebody somewhere suggested that any half-witted American citizen might have foretold that this country would be drawn into the European war. I assume that it was upon this supposition that the Chief of Ordnance in the investigation before the Senate Military Committee was asked what his bureau had been doing from August 4, 1914, when Belgium was invaded. I infer that this question was prompted by the supposition that any half-witted citizen should have known we would enter the war and, therefore, that the Ordnance Bureau should have instantly increased its activities. I infer that it was upon this theory that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in his New York speech was provoked to put the stigma of utter failure upon our military managers.

I do not agree that any half-witted citizen might have foreseen in 1914 our participation in this tragedy. I disagree for the reason that the major sentiment in this country was against entering the war and the President of the United States, with surpassing patience was ceaselessly endeavoring to avoid the calamity. The Congress of the United States was opposed to war; and we witnessed in this Chamber the remarkable spectacle, in 1915, after the *Lusitania* was sunk, of 152 Members of the House so determined to avoid participation in the struggle that they voted practically to abandon the indubitable rights of the country to sail its ships upon the high seas or to prosecute commerce with belligerent or even neutral nations. I disagree, because as late as the closing months of 1916 one of the great political parties of the country, to which Mr. CHAMBERLAIN belonged, reelected Woodrow Wilson President of the United States because, among other considerations, he had been wise and brave enough to keep us out of war, and could confidently be relied upon to do all that mortal man might honorably do to avert the horrible affliction. [Applause.] I do not know what was the attitude or what were the utterances of the Oregon critic in the presidential campaign—whether he applauded the President or censured him. But I do know, Mr. Chairman, that if the Oregon Senator in 1914 or 1915 or 1916 had the prescience to foresee that we should enter the war, the weight of his culpability is such as no good citizen would like to endure.

CHAMBERLAIN DID NOT FUNCTION.

Why did not the Ordnance Bureau function? Why were we short of modern rifles and heavy artillery? Let the Chief of Ordnance tell the story of how the Ordnance Department of the Government did function to the fullest extent of lawful permissibility. I shall put into the record—for it can do no harm—extracts from Gen. Crozier's testimony bearing on the subject. But in contemplating the sweeping indictment of his Government by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN the astounding thing to which I invite your attention right now is the fact that, with all his precognition, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN did not function. He was and is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate, with access to every particle of available information. In a large sense he held the purse strings upon military expenditures, because the Senate nearly always increases and rarely ever decreases appropriations. For a long time this Government has owned two arsenals, one at Springfield and the other at Rock Island. Ten years before the war the appropriation for small arms in these establishments aggregated \$1,700,000; a year later, \$1,778,000; a year later, \$1,700,000—at a time when nobody in America could have dreamed of war. And yet in 1915, practically two years after Mr. CHAMBERLAIN had assumed the chairmanship of the Senate Military Committee, when for seven months war had raged in Europe, the appropriation for small arms had gone down to the pitiful mark of \$250,000, and that, Mr. Chairman, so far as the record discloses, without one word of protest or even admonition from these adversary critics and calamity shriekers. Furthermore, the fires at the Rock Island Arsenal had long been out; how long I do not know. The arsenal at Springfield, where the best rifle in the world is made, was running at one-eighth of its capacity. The war had reached its trench-fighting stage, furnishing a fair inference of a protracted struggle. Kitchener had predicted that it would last three years. Notwithstanding these things, Mr. Chairman, the men who now affect preknowledge of future events did not increase by one dollar the trifling appropriation for small arms, but reduced it from the preceding year by nearly 50 per cent. The expert foremen and skilled artisans at the Government armories had been scattered and the forces disorganized and demoralized, so that later, when operations were resumed, the Ordnance Bureau had to get these people back

by bidding high against private establishments engaged on munitions for foreign governments. Was Crozier to blame for that? Is this soldier to be assailed and his reputation destroyed by the cruel imputation of inefficiency leveled by the Oregon Senator at this New York meeting against every bureau and department of his Government? I protest, Mr. Chairman, it is not just; for Gen. Crozier, we are told, did not know the truth. The President did not know the truth. Secretary of War Garrison did not know the truth. Tardieu and Lloyd-George, great ministers of munitions of foreign governments, Scott and Bliss, Pershing and Kuhne—none of these knew the truth. Only this world-wise Oregon critic knew the truth, and at the critical moment he failed to function! [Laughter and applause.] With a moving picture of America at war before his eyes, with strong conviction in his mind, distressed by his very contemplation of our utter inefficiency, he permitted the small-arms appropriation of the American Congress in the very year that the *Lusitania* was sunk to go down to the contemptible figure of \$250,000!

FUNCTIONED THE WRONG WAY.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the Oregon Senator was inspired to make that savage indictment of the Government in his New York speech by the supposition voiced by somebody that any half-witted American citizen should have known as early as August, 1914, that this country might be drawn into the European war, I cite a circumstance now that painfully accentuates his own responsibility for our lack of preparation. In the military appropriation bill which passed the House in 1915, long after the war began, there was an appropriation of \$50,000 for motor trucks for the Army; but, trifling as was the sum, contemptible as it must have seemed to anyone who was reasonably certain that the United States was on the brink of war, the distinguished Oregonian had it cut to \$25,000! With what result upon our activities at this time the House may judge from this extract from the testimony of Maj. Gen. O'Ryan, of the Twenty-seventh Division, Camp Wadsworth, who said, in speaking of the difficulties of training down there:

It is impossible for lack of mechanical transportation. For instance, we have not automobiles enough to haul wood from the depot to get it to our organizations.

And Maj. Gen. Greble, at Camp Bowie, testified that his division urgently required 245 motor trucks, but had not even 1. It required 46 motor cars and had just 1. The escort wagons, he testified, were drawn by mules, and Gen. Greble added:

If we do not get those things until we get abroad, why, we won't have trained motormen to look after them.

Talk about functioning! Here is an instance in which the distinguished Oregon critic of the Government functioned the wrong way. [Laughter and applause.] He knew we should go to war—any idiot could have foretold that—but he imagined that the surest and quickest way to win the war was to cut the appropriation for rifles to a negligible sum and have the escort wagons of the Army drawn by mules instead of being propelled by motors! [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, what about the half-witted Congress of the United States—the Sixty-fourth Congress, I mean? Could not we see, as late as August, 1916, that we should inevitably be drawn into this maelstrom of hell-fire? That was only eight months before we actually were drawn into it. Had not we sense enough to see so short a time ahead a thing which our Oregon critic had so surely seen three years before? And if we could, why did we not? Why did we deliberately sit here and make out a war program and make up a war budget to be extended over a period of three years, knowing that we would be at death's grapple in a little more than as many months? If it was so plain that we should go to war at any moment, why did we not compact the whole program into an emergency scheme, making every appropriation immediately available, and starting every factor and every facility of our national being into operation?

VICTIM OF THE THING WE HATE.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, the utter proneness of poor human nature to evade just responsibility and to reprehend in others the ugly things that most afflict our own records and dispositions! Why not be strictly honest with ourselves and brutally frank with the country? Let us tell the unhappy truth, which is that, for a century and a half, we have emphasized the single warning of Washington against "entangling alliances abroad" and sadly neglected his admonition about a sane preparation against war. We have hated militarism with such a holy hate that now we constrain heaven and earth to avoid becoming its victim. Our aversion to a large standing army is traditional and constitutional—bred in the blood and bone of successive generations. The whole policy of the Nation for all these years has been antagonistic to preparation. No one group of men is to blame,

No one political party above another is to be censured. If anything, some of the most frantic protestants against our plight share tremendously the responsibility for our condition, and conspicuous among these culpable critics are the distinguished gentleman who made that New York speech and the distinguished gentleman who led the applause of the unbridled indictment. [Applause.]

A WANTON CHARGE EXAMINED.

But because we were unprepared is no reason to infer that we are not being prepared; and being prepared, Mr. Chairman, at a pace that has amazed the European nations in arms. Gen. Crozier's testimony, and that of other witnesses, shows conclusively that there is no particle of excuse for the charge that the Ordnance Bureau was indifferent to passing events, that it was supine, that it did nothing to anticipate trouble, that it fell down and has ceased to function. The testimony is to the contrary, the facts are the very reverse; and the evidence and ascertained facts together would warrant a characterization of the charge as wanton.

Gen. Crozier declared that prior to the entry of this country into the war "a good deal of thinking was done, and a good deal of discussion had among officers as to the form of expansion in the event of war." A competent officer was "assigned to the task of getting additional personnel, looking up methods, ascertaining the means of getting reserve officers and of listing these officers." Months before the war the Chief of Ordnance "commenced to inventory the manufacturers of the country who would be capable of doing the kind of work required." Drawings were made of the things that would be needed in largest quantities, photolithographed, and sent out from the mailing lists supplied by technical journals. Letters were written to appropriate industries to get their capacity and to ascertain their willingness to accept contracts, and the replies were card indexed for reference when needed. As far back as the summer before the war Gen. Crozier detailed a West Point officer, momentarily freed from his academic duties, to aid with technical advice the advisory committee of the Council of National Defense in compiling kindred information. Said Gen. Crozier:

We got some valuable assistance from the General Munitions Board in selecting establishments with which to place some of our large orders. That was another function of that board—I mentioned one of them in the early part of my statement. Another function was to inform us as to where there might be found people who could probably do our work and would probably be willing to do it—people who had not been in the habit of bidding for Government work, but might have been making shafting and locomotive axles, or something of that sort, which was allied to our work, so that they probably could do ours. Those gentlemen, from their knowledge of the industries of the country, were able in a number of instances to deliver to us supplies of that kind and to save time in opening negotiations with them.

Gen. Crozier and his little staff informed themselves about the troubles of the European nations and studied these problems with a view to the avoidance of mistakes. The artillery supply tables contemplated a much larger proportion of shrapnel than shells; but the blunder of the British in that regard was escaped by reversing the proposition. After funds became available, under our three-year program, contracts were let as rapidly as plans could be effected. The closed armory at Rock Island, which had been kept closed in spite of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's prevision of war was reopened, the scattered operatives who could be gotten back were recalled and others secured, and activities at both arsenals greatly increased.

But what did the three-year plan amount to, Mr. Chairman, to a man who considered as imminent the participation of this country in the war? It was insignificant; it was a mere bagatelle. Prior to 1916 no appropriation by Congress for field artillery was as large as \$3,000,000. In July and August, of 1916, Congress under the three-year plan set aside \$16,000,000. But did that reflect the expectation of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN or anybody else that we would in a few months enter this world war? The direct, crushing answer to the question is found in the fact that when we actually did declare war \$171,000,000 was immediately appropriated, and four months later \$225,000,000 was appropriated for field artillery. If \$396,000,000 was required for this purpose when we entered the war, whereas a few months before we made available only \$16,000,000, why did the military genius who indicted his Government in New York stand for this act of imbecility in Washington? He confessedly knew we were going to war; why did he not tell those of us who did not know that we were paltering with a grave question and making ill provision for a desperate situation?

CROZIER'S WARNINGS UNHEEDED.

It takes a great while to build guns; it has taken as long as seven years to design and turn out a great gun in Germany. Gen. Crozier, as far back as 1906, warned the Congress and the country of our utter lack of preparation, and for years suc-

cessively repeated the warning. In January, 1911, he pointed out that we were "worse off in this matter of field artillery than in anything else," and warned that "in case of an emergency of any importance, the field artillery of the United States would be found positively insufficient." The emergency has come, and not even an appropriation of \$16,000,000 immediately before going to war nor of \$396,000,000 immediately after going to war can provide all the guns we need as we need them. The Congress can not evade its responsibility, and to attempt to shift it to the War Department and thus to discredit by a charge of inefficiency every branch and bureau of the Military Establishment is an unspeakable injustice.

Over against the harsh and cruel opinions of these political critics I give you the judgment of a great business man, whose technical and practical training and familiarity with events render of real value what he says on the subject. Mr. Vauclain, of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, member of the War Industries Board, in his testimony before the committee, said in response to a suggestion that the Ordnance Department is a little too slow and disorganized:

I have lived with them since the war started and I have not found them disorganized. I do not think we have the maximum of efficiency in any department just at present because all of these departments have had to be expanded so tremendously; but they have maintained an efficiency that has been surprising to me and very satisfactory. I do not think we have a single department, taking them as a whole, that is under 90 per cent efficient. I think when they get their full stride there will be no more efficient organization in the world than we will have.

If anything, there is ground for commendation for the manner in which the officers in the Ordnance Departments of the Army and Navy have arisen to the situation. It is a tremendous task. It is only those who have lived with it as I have lived with it, day and night, Sundays included—I have given my entire time to it—who can realize what a tremendous proposition it is.

I do not care how much time has been lost or apparently lost in the first few months, we could not have been possibly any further ahead.

ENORMOUS CAPACITY NOW.

There is a great deal more, to the same effect, from this man, described by Senator FRELINGHUYSEN as the "driving power" up there. Mr. Vauclain built for the British Government in this country and operated the greatest munitions plant in the world, and we may put a higher appraisal on his definite judgment than on the sensational clatter of politicians who would turn our attention from the battle field to the forum—because they stand in the forum. Asked if the Ordnance Department "appreciated the great necessity of speed in replenishing the supply of heavy artillery along the French border," Mr. Vauclain in December said:

We will have an enormous capacity in that line before we are three months older, and we not only have capacity enough to manufacture all the guns we need for ourselves, but to manufacture forgings and other stuff to send abroad.

At present there are over 600,000 tons of military supplies and of steel forgings lying on the wharves to be sent to France.

I could detain the House with citation after citation from other responsible sources to confirm what Mr. Vauclain says, but what is the use? The Secretary of War himself in his great and inspiring statement last week smashed the line of adverse comment from end to end.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 15 minutes more.

OTHER FALSE CHARGES.

Mr. GLASS. Great outcry was raised about the texture and weight of the cloth supplied by the Government to the troops. I assume that this is another thing that prompted the distinguished Oregon Senator to indict the Government before that New York audience as inefficient in every bureau and department. It was said that the wool content in the uniforms had been diminished and shoddy introduced. The testimony established the incontrovertible fact that whereas, before the war, our 16-ounce melton uniform cloth was 75 per cent wool and 25 per cent cotton, it is now 100 per cent virgin wool, and thus that malicious disparagement was quickly disproved. [Applause.]

I assume that another reason for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's sweeping indictment of his Government in New York was the charge that shoddy, or reworked wool, had been introduced into the overcoat and blanket fabrics of the Army. And so it had been; but why did not the critics have the frankness to tell the public that it was done with a view to conserving the wool supply available to this country? When we entered the war there was an embargo on wool shipments from Australia. Our European allies had contracted for large stocks. In this matter, as in others, we entered upon an almost preempted field. It was necessary to be cautious, but the expert testimony is convincing that had there been an overabundant supply of wool the introduction of shoddy into the coarser materials of the Army improved rather than impaired the product. Col. William M. Wood, of

Boston, formerly a member of the Council of National Defense, vouched for by Senator WEEKS, of Massachusetts, as "president of the largest manufacturing establishment in the United States," likewise president of the American Woolen Co., in a letter dated January 28 of this year, says the action of the Government in this particular deserves praise rather than criticism. He says that from 90 to 95 per cent of all the overcoatings made in the world, including some of the finest fabrics, contain a measurable quantity of reworked wool. I shall append the letter of Col. Wood here, in order that we may put the expert judgment of a great wool manufacturer against the amateur opinion of the men who asperse the Government without knowledge of the things they criticize.

ADVANTAGES OF SHODDY.

The recommendation of the manufactures committee to the Council of National Defense looking to the utilization of reworked wool is, in my opinion, worthy of consideration and not to be disparaged, as it has been in some quarters. Reworked wool can be introduced into fabrics which are used for overcoats and blankets so as to improve rather than impair their usefulness. It gives a better fitting property to the cloth, makes a warmer, closer, tighter fabric, provided a judicious proportion is used.

The manufactures committee, composed of patriotic and practical men, gave the Government their best judgment, based on the knowledge and experience acquired through years of effort in practical manufacturing, in recommending the judicious use of reworked wool.

I am willing to venture the statement that in the construction of from 90 to 95 per cent of all the overcoatings made in the world, including some of the finest fabrics, there is used a measurable quantity of reworked wool or shoddy, so that the prejudice which appears to exist against the use of this kind of raw material is unfounded and unjust under modern conditions of manufacture.

As confirming this, I may mention that all the heavier military cloth used for export in this country under specifications given by their respective Governments contains a large percentage of reworked wool.

DELAY OF CLOTHING.

It is charged—and I assume that this furnished the basis of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's New York indictment—that there was delay in the delivery of blouses and overcoats to the cantonments. That is true. Gen. O'Ryan testified that his division, comprising 31,000 troops, had a shortage of 900 overcoats. Other officers testified to similar shortages. Undoubtedly there was delay—provoking delay. But, again I say, it would have been a miracle had there been no delays. In the first place, the estimates were for but 500,000 men, then 1,000,000, then 1,500,000. Contracts were promptly let, and the list of manufacturers secured to make these clothes fills 73 closely printed pages of the hearings. Orders were issued for over 2,000,000 overcoats and from April 1 to December 15, 2,000,000 were delivered or in process of delivery. There was delay, of course; but the critics magnify the fault and never tell the country any of the reasons for delay. They suppress the fact that time and again there were strikes among the mill operatives and the garment makers all over the country; that transportation was congested; and that other unforeseen and unavoidable things intervened. But, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. CHAMBERLAIN made his New York speech, I doubt if there was a cantonment in the United States that was not fully supplied with overcoats and blouses and other necessary equipment. Perhaps by that time Gen. Greble had gotten some motor trucks and could dispense with a few of his mules. So the departments here had functioned and were functioning, and the statement made by the Oregon Senator in New York had little, if any, justification in fact.

THE CAMP DEATH RATE.

I assume that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's New York indictment of the Government was founded on the charge that base-hospital facilities at the cantonments were incomplete and that the space allowance for the enlisted men was insufficient and that, because of an insufficiency of clothing and because of overcrowding, sickness ensued and the death rate was increased. Of course, it is distressing that our boys away from home should have to die at all; and it is for the very reason that parents everywhere have a keen regard to this situation, and a tender solicitude for their absent sons, that any criticism should have a sure basis of fact and no element of exaggeration. Sadly enough there has been illness in camps, aggravated in some degree by temporary overcrowding. But even this, Mr. Chairman, produced no abnormal death rate. Contrasts are disagreeable and not always fair, but at least some indication as to the utter indefensibility of the attack on the Medical Department of the Army may be derived from the statement that the death rate of the city of Washington is 17 per 1,000 persons between the ages of 20 and 40 years, while the death rate at the Army cantonments has been 8.2 per 1,000; and this rate at the cantonments contrasted with the death rate from disease in the War with Spain is 8.2 as against 20 per 1,000. I do not cite this circumstance with any view to reviving the scandals of the Spanish War, but merely to point out that inefficiency has no politics and the camp casualties of a great war enterprise no party.

FAULTS EXAGGERATED, ACHIEVEMENTS SUPPRESSED.

To begin with, the recommendations of the Surgeon General were strictly adhered to by the Army boards in designing the camps, and in the second place the record shows that the instant overcrowding at two or three cantonments was reported orders were issued to correct the evil by the immediate shipment of additional tentage and the exercise of other proper activities. But if this fact was known it was carefully suppressed by the critics. Scrupulous pains were taken not to give the country this tranquilizing information and every effort made to agitate the country by magnifying the consequences of these initial difficulties.

QUESTIONS SATURATED WITH PRECONCEPTION.

The Surgeon General of the Army is a professional man of international reputation, knowing which the adversaries of the War Department did not dare assail him directly; but it was sought to have it appear that Gen. Gorgas was ignored in all of these matters. I have here in a New York newspaper what I assume is the full stenographic report of the examination of Gen. Gorgas, making five columns of fine print; and I trust the Members of the House will read the testimony and ascertain for themselves whether the spirit of many of the interrogatories reflected a desire to elicit only the truth and all the truth or were saturated with preconception and a desire to reach a fixed conclusion. Let me illustrate what I exactly mean. Gen. Gorgas was asked if he had been "consulted as to the location of these camps," and responded by saying "no." Now, that question suggested two considerations, one related to military ethics and the other went directly to the question of efficiency. Having established an apparent discourtesy to the Surgeon General, what was the next natural question to ask? Should not the Surgeon General have instantly been asked if he approved the location of the camps and if they were in healthy localities? That was the vital point; that is what the people of this country wanted to know. But no such question was ever asked Gen. Gorgas. The direction of the inquiry was instantly shifted, and but for a statement by Gen. Gorgas, voluntarily made later on, nobody could have ascertained from the examination that Gen. Gorgas unqualifiedly indorsed the location of every one of these cantonments as suitable and healthy. [Applause.]

It may be added that in the subsequent examination of the Secretary of War that official declared that a personal representative of the Surgeon General's office was on the Army board of three members which located every one of these camps. The country is made to believe that there was no heat in any of the hospitals at these camps, and that patients are exposed to the full rigors of winter, whereas Gen. Gorgas explicitly stated that while the steam-heating apparatus in some of the camps was uncompleted all of them meanwhile were heated by stoves. And so with the question of pneumonia. The Surgeon General of the Army was asked if the scarcity of clothing and the failure of steam heat had not started the ravages of pneumonia, and he literally startled his inquisitors by telling them that the greatest epidemic of pneumonia he had ever known occurred at Panama, in the Tropics, and that pneumonia was not necessarily produced by cold or exposure.

ANONYMOUS CHARGES CONSIDERED.

Let me give the House one other incident of this investigation tending to show the hostile nature of the inquiry and exhibiting the readiness in some quarters to take as a basis of inquiry anonymous and irresponsible and indeed incredible rumors. When Maj. Gen. O'Ryan was being catechized this extract from a letter was brought to his attention:

I have had the privilege of reading a letter to his mother by a neighbor of mine, now a soldier in camp at Spartanburg. While making no complaint for himself, among other things, he writes the following:

"It is very cold here and trench duty has become nothing but needless exposure of the men. The battalion that relieved ours had 29 men frozen in the trenches, mostly from the hips down, but one man had his face so badly frozen so that when they took his helmet off they took the face flesh with it. Two of the men have died and the others are in the hospital."

If things like this are whitewashed under Gen. Gorgas's report of "Epidemics of pneumonia" or if any system of censorship aims to prevent men from protecting themselves from utterly unfit officers by reporting it, it would seem that investigation should not stop until the officers responsible are executed for murder.

Gen. O'Ryan was asked what he knew "about that condition," and with the fine spirit of a real man and a soldier, he made this biting answer:

I think it is the duty of anybody who can get that letter and can give us the name of that man, to do it, and let us try him.

[Applause.]

No such incident ever occurred. Gen. O'Ryan pronounced it the mere gibbering of a letter-writing recruit desiring to pose among his people at home as a hero or a martyr. He stated that, from September 1 to December 22, there had been 14

deaths at the Spartanburg camp, 4 of them were of men in a motor truck struck by a train, 2 from tuberculosis, 2 from diabetes, 4 from pneumonia, 2 from myocarditis. Fourteen deaths in four months out of 31,000 men, which, as Gen. O'Ryan pointed out, "is a health record that is almost incredible." [Applause.] But Gen. O'Ryan's severe denunciation of this wanton rumor is buried in a committee hearing, while these monstrous inventions, with a few pathetic incidents that are true, find their way under sensational headlines to the newspapers of the country.

A HIDEOUS NIGHTMARE FLAUNTED.

I wonder if that gruesome fable of men frozen stiff in the trenches of South Carolina was typical of the complaints which incited the Oregon Senator to charge an utter breakdown of the Military Establishment of the United States? If not so, perhaps it was the "confidential communication" that was borrowed by him from another distinguished Senator and which, between the two, was treasured for three weeks in their breast pockets and never brought to the attention of any military authority charged with the investigation of such incidents and the application of the punitive code of the Army. [Applause.] It is strange, Mr. Chairman, that Gen. O'Ryan's frank intimation as to the obvious ethics of such cases did not operate to avert the shocking spectacle involved in the subsequent use which was made of the unhappy episode at Camp Doniphan, where a sick soldier is alleged to have been subjected to cruel neglect, resulting in death. The excuse given for not instantly demanding an inquiry by the War Department, with the object of redressing the fault, is that the letter was "confidential." That plainly is not true. The very text of the letter itself shows that it is not so. The avowed purpose of the letter was to prevent the recurrence of such an incident. It was written to be brought to the attention of the War Department through the medium of a public man of rank and influence. It expressly was not written to instigate or to fortify a theatrical public indictment of the Government as both inefficient and brutal. [Applause.] On the contrary, the writer of the letter categorically disclaims any such belief or desire. It was only after its receipt in Washington that the letter was given a malignant interpretation and devoted to a wanton attack on the Military Establishment of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to think of this episode in a spirit of moderation. It is impossible to speak of it in temperate terms. To take a single pitiful, tragic case, the like of which has not occurred and probably will not occur at any other camp, and without affording the least opportunity of inquiry blazon it in the public prints to affright the minds and wring the hearts of American mothers with the fear that their sons may be the victims of an inhuman military system, is a thing so inconceivably gross as to make one shudder at the contemplation. [Applause.] As the father of sons who wear the uniform of their country, I protest against the flaunting of this hideous nightmare before my fireside; and, in the name of the women of Virginia and the Nation, I repel the evil suggestion contained in this astounding assault upon the military arm of the Government. [Applause.]

WHAT A CONTRAST!

Contrast the spirit of those responsible for this method of attack with the fine sympathy and patriotism of Mary Roberts Rinehart, whose letter to the Secretary of War is an epic. Mrs. Rinehart, once a trained nurse, now a virile author of note, has great familiarity with Army hospital conditions; and, resenting the intimation that the one pathetic incident relied on to stir antagonism to the Government is typical of the general situation at the cantonments, she wrote Mr. Baker, among other things, as follows:

I do feel that some step should be taken to reassure our women just now. It is only fair to them. It is cruel to allow every mother in the country to judge the medical care that will be given to her boy while in the service because here and there, in the chaos of our readjustment, men have been given responsibilities they are unable or unwilling to fulfill. That we have such men is more than a national misfortune. That they have been placed in positions of trust is a national calamity. But the mothers of the country should know in fairness to themselves that the number of such inefficient is small. We will not rest, we women, until they have all been removed. But that, I know, will be at once. It must be at once.

I have a son in an Army cantonment. He enlisted as a private. He would receive, if he became ill, exactly the same treatment as any other enlisted man in our new Army. And I should have not only no hesitation in placing him in the cantonment hospital, but I should do it with absolute confidence.

One hospital I know well. It is typical of other cantonment hospitals. It is under the same Army medical department direction as the others, and it is only right to assume that conditions there are representative. The same rules govern all these hospitals. The same sums are spent on them. The same system is followed. The food is the same, the supplies, the medical staff, the nurses.

And I have never seen a better war hospital than the one at Camp Sherman. I will go further, and say that in its operating rooms, its X-ray department, its eye and ear department, its nose and throat depart-

ment, its dental department; in short, in its facilities for caring for every emergency and every weakness, it will bear comparison with any civilian hospital.

And what is true of the base hospital at Camp Sherman is true of the others.

I have watched the development of the war hospital system from the beginning, when I saw it first on paper in the office of the Surgeon General up to two weeks ago. I watched because it was a vital matter to me. I had a husband and a son in the service. I am like the other women of this country. I would be content with nothing less than the best. And I feel that we are on the way to the best.

Faithfully, yours,

MARY ROBERTS RINEHART.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I fervently pray God, in all my public career, to spare me such a reproof as the letter of that noble woman conveys to those who would prefer to hinder their Government by aspersion rather than to help it by counsel. But, sir, that is the way the inquisition has gone. Every delay, avoidable or unavoidable; every minor blunder, defensible or indefensible; every one of the few pathetic cases of neglect, explicable or inexplicable—all these have been arrayed and tortured into proof of a total collapse of this administration. The idle tittle-tattle of irresponsible camp spectators in this country have vied for grave consideration with the startling impartations of the British prime minister to an itinerant American Congressman abroad who, unable to contain the confidential revelations of the great man, quickly "leaked" in the presence of the Government's adversaries. [Laughter.] We see, too, the trail and hear the lamentations of disappointed contractors, and witness the insufferable spectacle of congressional Johnnie Hooks running through the camp crying, "Contracts! Contracts!" when men are dying on the seas and on the battle fields for human liberty. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

A BIBLICAL ANALOGY.

Mr. GLASS. I have several times been told that the severest of these criticisms of the Government have emanated from gentlemen who protest an unaffected devotion to this administration, and by that I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, that once there was a lady in the play who protested too much. It also brings to me a vision of that memorable episode of the field of Gibeon, in the time of David, the King, when Joab met Amasa, whose face he caressed and whose body he despoiled. You remember the story. With the customary salutation of affection Joab, with his right hand, took hold of Amasa's beard and asked: "Is it well with thee, my brother?" And Amasa noted not the sword that was in Joab's other hand; and Joab smote Amasa under the fifth rib and laid his bowels in the dust! I might deduce from this scriptural incident that all salutations of personal esteem are not entirely unaccompanied by danger, but that is not the point of the recitation. The thing that chiefly interests me is the fact that the President of the United States has no beard, but has eyes keen enough to perceive the sword in the other hand of those who would savagely slash him in public rather than confer with him in confidence. [Applause.] The other thing about this biblical illustration which it is worth while to recall is the fact that pretty soon after that left-handed jab on the field of Gibeon Joab himself perished. [Laughter and applause.]

PRODIGIOUS ACHIEVEMENTS.

Mr. Chairman, as will have been observed, I have addressed myself so far solely to pointing out and answering some of the criticisms leveled at the Government. I have not intended to imply that no mistakes have been made. I have not meant to say that there have not been delays and inefficiencies and imperfections. There have been all of these, and had there not been the experience of this country in this war would have been vastly different from its experience in any other war, and vastly different from the experience of any other country in any war that ever cursed humanity. But I do mean to say, on the whole, that there have been marvelous achievements, and that we have done as well if not better than was thought possible in the circumstances. When I think of the stupendous nature of the task with which this Government was confronted I have literally a feeling of awe, and when I consider the prodigious progress that has been and is being made I wonder how it could have been done. The expansion in nearly every bureau and branch of the Government has been something almost inconceivable. Before the war the Chief of Ordnance had 10 officers on his immediate staff; now he has 700, nearly all drawn from civilian life, and his bureau has 3,000. For five years preceding the war the average expenditure of the bureau per day was \$35,000; to carry out its program now the daily expenditure is \$13,000,000. The office space of the bureau

before the war was 15,000 square feet; to-day it is 16 acres. So with other bureaus. In large degree the brains as well as the patriotism of the country have been mustered, and the war machine is getting its head of steam at a tremendous pace.

Some of these civilians who have come here to serve are men of great distinction in business and in the professions, men like Samuel McRoberts, executive manager of the National City Bank, head of procurement, and Guy E. Tripp, chairman of the board of directors of the Westinghouse Co., head of production, all working under the direction of that tested and accomplished soldier Brig. Gen. Charles B. Wheeler, Acting Chief of Ordnance, with an exceptional record in this country and in our insular possessions, himself surrounded by a corps of splendid young officers who have not their superior anywhere to be found.

There has been lack of coordination; there has been conflict of authority; there have been poutings and bickerings over rank and precedence; but still the machine is driving ahead. Its velocity will not be increased, but rather impeded, by perverse politicians pounding at its vitals as it goes along. [Applause.]

Not until the third year of the war could Great Britain venture to apply partially a conscription law. Not until a few months ago could Canada do it in opposition to the rebellious threat of one of its largest provinces.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I have no more time, may I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to yield some of his time?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am very glad to yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. GLASS. I thank the gentleman.

It has not been done as to Ireland, and Australia has twice declined to attempt the system. And yet this Republic, with a clear realization of the situation, instantly applied the democratic method of selective draft, and the country responded with unparalleled spirit of patriotism. Ten million young men marched up and registered for enlistment. Such a thing never happened before in this or in any other country on the civilized earth. Great military cities, known as cantonments, were built almost overnight; and to these, without friction or hesitation, our boys went, offering their bodies and their lives in defense of human liberty. We have sent nearly ten times as many troops abroad as the French and English military missions had expected that we could do in the time required, and we have trained and are training an army far beyond the original estimates. This year we will have in France more than a million men. And what a stupendous work has been done over there in building great piers and wharves and miles of houses for the supply quarters of the Army! Six hundred miles of railroad reconstructed from ports to battle line, and a thousand other great things. Yet our Army is a myth!

Within the time at my disposal it would be impossible to enumerate in detail even the major items of this stupendous Military Establishment. That was done, in masterful fashion, by the Secretary of War on Tuesday of last week, and I wish every American citizen would read that compendium of things which the Government has done to prepare the Nation for this ordeal. And now to have men whose necks are sore from pulling against the tongue end of the war wagon stand up in public places and revile those who have done nothing but go forward is enough to excite popular indignation. Men who obstructed and voted against every shipping measure proposed by the Government have the audacity now to rage against our lack of shipping facilities. Men who wanted to put a stop to the industries of this country and who mercilessly flayed the munition manufacturers of America as murderers now affect alarm and indignation because the Government is not instantly supplied with guns and ammunition. Was it Napoleon or some other great general who said that "An army travels on its belly"? Let me read you this extract from the statement of the Secretary of War last week:

I want to make but one further observation on this general subject of the Quartermaster and Supply Department. I think it is not unfair for me to say that in the matter of provision of food, no army ever assembled anywhere was fed as regularly, as well, as nutritiously, as appetizingly, as this Army. I think you gentlemen of the committee, and surely the men at the War Department, will agree that, while there have been complaints about other things, the almost unanimous testimony, so far as I know the unanimous testimony of this Army, is that its food has been of the highest quality; that there has been no suggestion of defective quality or insufficiency in the quantity; that its preparation has been of the highest character, and, generally, the very great problem of food supply for this vast and hastily organized group of men has been carried out with most extraordinary success.

[Applause.]

What is true of this department is measurably true of nine-tenths of the Army bureaus; yet every branch of the War Department was comprehended in that incredible assault upon the Government of the United States, in which it was proclaimed

to the world that the Military Establishment of the country is a myth.

BLOODGUILT.

I suppose these expositors of calamity imagine that by these criticisms they wash their hands of the blood of American soldiers! Mr. Chairman, they will wash, and wash, and wash again to no purpose. "The damned spot will not out." Not all the waters of Abanah and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, with those of Israel combined, could cleanse them of the offense nor obliterate the frightful consequences of their heedless speech. The address of the President of the United States in behalf of a just and permanent peace, to reach the German people in uncensored form, must be flung from aeroplanes at eminent hazard; but these prophets of disaster will have no restrictive audience in the central empires.

Almost at the very moment that Von Hertling had appointed to state his terms, at a time when internal tumult and doubt and distress, reaching out for peace, were threatening to topple thrones and banish dynasties, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, without warning of any description, projects this astonishing attack on the government of his country!

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired. Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has promised me 10 minutes, and with his permission I shall be glad to yield it to the gentleman from Virginia. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. That is, indeed, gracious, and I thank the gentleman.

Without qualification of any sort, in unmeasured terms of reprehension, indifferent alike to titled consequence and to subordinate degree, to epaulet or bar, the Oregon Senator comprehended the entire Government of the United States, in all its branches and bureaus, in an accusation of utter impotency! The Military Establishment, he said, was a myth—it was nonexistent! That's what Reventlow and Terpitz had been teaching. That's the doctrine with which the scornful masters of the German people had been solacing their discontent and quieting their fears of disaster.

How obliged to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and his kindred spirits will the Kaiser and his kindred spirits be for thus publicly confirming their contemptuous estimate of American willingness and American capacity to fight for American freedom! Every soldier in the German trenches will read the amazing indictment; every peasant in the land will know that, speaking from a high and responsible place, charged with intimate knowledge and not inconsiderable power, this Oregon Senator openly proclaimed a shameful breakdown of this Nation in war. By this speech the declining morale of German citizen and soldier will be retrieved; their courage to hold fast and fight on will be inspired; their resolve to dictate terms on a victorious field will be renewed; the struggle may thus be long protracted. Who can not foretell the sequel to this? Thousands of American boys who might have escaped may be maimed in battle; other thousands who might have survived may find their last resting place in the plains of Flanders or on the heights of the Argonne. Yet these mad soothsayers of evil, with dramatic unction, imagine that they are acquitted of bloodguiltiness! [Applause.]

THE REAL VISION.

Why may we not, Mr. Chairman, have an end of these bickerings, these petty divisions, these perverse attempts to retard the Government in its great and pressing enterprises? Why may we not, in the place of these, bend every effort toward a unity of spirit and purpose to win this war? I have in mind an incident which I shall remember to my dying day, and I could very earnestly wish that I possessed the facility of speech impressively to depict it to the House. When the Congress had under consideration the selective-draft bill the governor of my State came to Washington for an interview with the President to protest against requiring Virginia boys to be drafted, instead of permitting them to volunteer. He also desired that State military units with a history and traditions dearly cherished should be permitted to retain their identity. A kinsman of J. E. B. Stuart, the greatest cavalry leader of the Confederacy, the Virginia governor, with all the sentiment and tenderness of an ancient Commonwealth in his vision, presented his case to the President with pathetic earnestness. When he had finished, the President, touched and gravely considerate, told Gov. Stuart that the one thing we most needed to realize just then was the fact that this is a Nation. It is not Virginia's war, he said, nor New England's war; not a war of the East or of the West or the North or the South. It is America's war. There should be intermingling of troops from all the States. We should submerge provincialism and sectionalism and party

spirit in one powerful flood of nationalism, which would carry us on to victory. The vision as the President saw and interpreted it was full of heart and inspiration.

And, Mr. Chairman, why may it not be so? Why may not the fathers and mothers of sons who are going across the seas to fight the great battle for freedom have the precious privilege of feeling that their boys are flanked on either side by a brave American comrade? What matters it whether he be from Massachusetts or Virginia, from Maine or Mississippi, from the Atlantic seaboard or the Pacific, from the Lake region or the Gulf, just so he be a true American soldier, willing to die for his comrades and his country. [Applause.] And when in the providence of God they shall come back and march in grand review, why may not all of us praise Heaven that, since they equally shared the perils of the struggle, equally they shall merit the honors and gratitude of this great united Nation? [Great applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOUSTON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution granting to certain persons in the active war service an extension of time within which application for insurance may be made under section 401 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. FRANCE and Mr. HOLLIS members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the list of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia yields back three minutes of the time yielded him.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members of the House of Representatives, "With malice toward none and charity for all," I desire to speak to my colleagues for a very few minutes upon the very live questions that confront our people. If we ever had any doubt that Sherman was right when he said war was hell, that doubt has been entirely removed in the past six months.

The offensive war of the uncivilized is for land and other things of value. The defensive war of the civilized nation is for the purpose of securing an honorable peace. While we must not let up one bit in our preparations and prosecutions of this war, it would be barbarism to refuse to discuss peace, and it is wicked and undemocratic not to allow everyone who is interested and who must bear the burden of tax and blood to speak their honest convictions as to what would be an honorable peace for our country. I see no profit in faultfinding, except where immediate correction can be made without interfering with our preparation for this war, and I regard it as unwise to discuss in party caucuses anything that affects the successful carrying on of this war, nor do I intend, if I can master myself, to indulge in party claims or party criticisms. I pray God that during this war we may be big enough to wipe out this middle aisle which separates an American Republican from an American Democrat. [Applause.] But I am told there is to be a new party formed, that which places upon its banner "No peace without victory." Of course, our President will not join that party, for his greatest message, a milestone in the march of civilization, was that message which declared for "peace without victory," and none of us who seek reelection need be afraid of that party, for those who are willing and anxious to continue to give the life of every American and every dollar of American money to transfer the territory of one nation to another will not be here to vote, they will have sacrificed their lives in the trenches of Europe.

You will remember that when the great Gladstone made the treaty of peace after the defeat of the British of Majuba Hill, Sir Michael Hicks Beach accused him of perfidy; that he had

made a treaty of peace after the defeat of the English arms, and therefore lost prestige for the English arms. Gladstone was a Christian statesman, and his answer was:

The world knows that England can conquer South Africa, but we want the world to know that England can do right.

We want to do right in this war, and we will do right in this war. We will not abandon for one moment the league of honor in which we, with our coworkers, fight the Imperial Government of Germany, nor will the American people allow our coworkers to drag us into interminable and unending war to settle the ungodly intrigues of royalty 50 years ago. [Applause.] The people of the United States are patient, there will be no riots that will shake our Government, for they know that in the cool, quiet days of next November they will be permitted to speak upon questions of life and death about which heretofore they have been silent. We are torn asunder now with plans for a new war board. The Constitution of the United States that gave life to this Congress and to the President and to the Supreme Court provides the war board to be elected by the people, and every one of you gentlemen are elected as a member of the war board under this provision of the Constitution which provides that Congress should make, "Rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" of the United States. If you have surrendered that power it is no time now to complain in the face of the enemy. As one of those who voted against war and opposed conscription for foreign service but pledged to the support of my country I say, so far as my observation goes in visiting the great cantonments, that the work of the Secretary of War has been marvelous and almost past belief. [Applause.] We knew, of course, when we declared war that there would be mistakes; that there would be graft and boodling, which is as natural a part of war as breath is to life. For God's sake let us quit fighting each other and fight the Kaiser. [Applause.] This is my theory in this war. I have great honor for the Secretary of War, though I do not know him. There is one thing my colleague from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] omitted to say. The Secretary of War had the courage to admit that he had made a mistake or delay, and he went about correcting it. You can trust a man like that. [Applause.]

We, being civilized and in the war only for the purpose of peace under the rule ought to look for peace at the first possible moment it can be had with honor.

The accomplishment of this peace is not solely an Executive problem, for, while the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, as I have stated, Congress should make rules governing the Army and Navy, because we are the Congress, and the people in the last analysis govern Congress, and if the people do not govern this one they will the next one. Action by Congress in these circumstances is not without precedent. I remember somewhere in my reading when an amendment was offered to an appropriation bill fixing the salary of a minister to a country that the President would not recognize, and it was offered on the theory that the Congress wished the President to know what the desire of Congress was.

In his last message the President of the United States—and he has frequently so demanded—said that the German people should speak, but of course he did not mean that the American people should not be heard on this great question. He expects that they will be heard, and the Congress should have the courage to demand to be heard for themselves and for the people. While his suggestions open an inviting field for discussion, the real thing that stands in the way of peace to-day—look it in the face, tell the truth about it; I know we are great for conservation here, but, for God's sake, let us quit conserving the truth and give out a little of that old-fashioned commodity—the truth is, that the thing that stands in the way of peace to-day, that peace that would solve all of these questions that confront us, and which have put us in trouble is what disposition shall be made of Alsace-Lorraine. Our French coworkers, God bless them, in this work are demanding that that territory, including the people—95 per cent of whom speak German and 80 per cent of whom are German—and the right to govern shall be turned over to our coworkers, and our good President is of the opinion that unless that is done Alsace-Lorraine will still stand as a menace to the peace of the world.

I beg leave, very respectfully—I may say humbly—and in the spirit of friendly counsel and not in the spirit of fault-finding, to say that the determination of whether the German or the French shall govern Alsace-Lorraine or whether they shall govern themselves, as suggested by the despised socialist, is not an American question. It is a question for the people of Alsace-Lorraine. The Republic of the United States was not born when that territory was taken by the French from the Germans, and nearly half a century has passed since the Germans took it from the French. And you gentlemen may can-

vass your districts from one end to the other and you will not find one father or mother who is willing to give their sons to settle a title of real estate in Europe. [Applause.]

I know you will meet constituents who will say, and you will meet editors who will write, that we will give every drop of blood in America to put Alsace-Lorraine back into France, but you will find that they safely stand under the American flag, with no danger of being conscripted into the trenches. And when an editor writes an editorial to the effect that he is willing to give every dollar to his country and every drop of your blood and mine, he is easily and cozily settled in the editorial sanctum, exposed to no danger beyond, possibly, the gout or apoplexy. [Laughter.]

Now, let us be fair with ourselves and let us be fair with our President. Let no man say that we do not love France. We do. When we hear the Marseillaise it brings a throb to our hearts like the sound of the Star-Spangled Banner. We know, however, those of us who have studied history, that the Franco-Prussian War was brought on by the Emperor of France, and it was brought on for conquest. Of course, the French people have established now a Republic, and we are more in sympathy with it. That happened during the war; but, as a matter of fact, it is only natural that they should want to see Alsace-Lorraine returned, and we would like to see it done. Anything that France wants we are for, but we want them to be for something that we are for. We do not want them to ask us to sacrifice the blood of American youth and break the hearts of a million American mothers to correct the brutality and blunders of the Kaiser and the Emperor 46 years ago. [Applause.]

But our President says if it is transferred back to France it will be the means of establishing peace. Now, again, very humbly and very respectfully, I can not reach that conclusion, and I must be allowed to think. I stood in the Place de la Concorde, in Paris, where that great monument has been erected by the French people to Alsace-Lorraine, and on the monument it says, "Taken from the French by the Germans," on such a date, "in 1871"; and below it says, "Retaken by the French on — day of —, in the year —."

And that monument has stood there for more than 40 years, a menace and a threat of war and encouragement to Krupp and other munition makers to keep their guns ready to "go to it" at any time.

Now, my colleagues, if for any reason this valuable territory should be forced back into France, look at it reasonably. Do not get mad about it. I will not get mad at you when you stand up here and say you are willing to give all the blood of this country except yours for that purpose.

I do not want you to get mad with me. But look at it! Just look at it! If you move it deliberately and against the will of the people of Alsace-Lorraine back into French territory, that monument that is a standing threat of war, will not be written in French. It will be written in German and moved from Paris to Berlin, a continuing threat of war. I believe that if the poor, "despised" Bolsheviks could have his way for a few minutes and those people be given self-government and allowed to govern themselves, Alsace-Lorraine would be neutral territory and thereafter an island of peace, and so far as that land is concerned the world would be at peace. There need be no threatening monuments either in Paris or Berlin.

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to discuss, and shall not discuss further, the solution of the greatest stumbling block in our way to an honorable peace, but simply to emphasize the fact that its disposition is not an American question. You, my colleagues, are the custodians of the Treasury of this country, you are the custodians of the blood of the American youth, and I, as one of your Members being willing to support this Government and support my country in this great war, will never vote to give the life of one American boy in a war of conquest, not one drop of American blood to settle questions in which the United States has no interest and not one American life to correct the blunders and brutalities of the Kaiser and the Emperor 50 years ago.

If any of my colleagues wish to settle this question, I recommend that they read an editorial in the world's greatest newspaper, which, of course, is published in Chicago. This paper has been the most warlike of any of the great papers, and shows it is in earnest by the actual enlistment at the front of its editors and employees. That great war newspaper early in October last stated editorially that the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France might be a part of "British war aims as well as part of French war aims, but that it was not a part of the war aims of the United States." Since the publication of the secret treaties between our allies we have discovered that when we went into the war for democracy, our good friends, the English, the Russians, and the French, had agreed just how our

English cousins and our French brothers were to slice up Germany, and that noble democrat, the Czar of Russia, was to have a slice of Turkey. We have also learned by the publication of the secret treaties that if we were successful in our fight for democracy that the King of Italy, that great commoner, could turn down the Pope and become sovereign over the farmers of a part of Austria.

And some of you may be were surprised when you discovered that our good friend, the Mikado, who does not want to own land in this country or send his children to the schools of California and does not want the Sandwich Islands or the Philippine Islands and who while in our fight for democracy has not found it convenient to send a man or a ship to help us while we are helping him. I say some of you may have been surprised that our Japanese friends, while expecting our assistance in this fight for democracy, had a secret treaty with the great democrat, the Czar, whereby they were to fight your Uncle Sam in the Far East in case action should arise and we need the whipping. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I give all honor to our President. In the very outset of his message he says that America stands against these secret treaties, and I call attention to them not for the purpose of showing any camouflage covering our cry for democracy but for the purpose of appealing to you as Americans to determine what are American questions that we are willing to sacrifice the lives of our sons for.

I have stated the great war newspaper in Chicago has for its leading editorial Saturday, October 13, 1917, the following:

THE UNITED STATES AND ALSACE.

The restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France may be a British as well as a French war objective, as proclaimed by British leadership. It is not an American war objective.

Sentimentally many Americans would be glad of a result that would give back these Provinces. But, regardless of sentiment, the American Government could not rightfully offer one conscripted soldier to this cause. Alsace-Lorraine must offer a value in American prospects before the life of an American conscript could be justly spent in such an issue.

At least we are justified in thinking that it is not worth conscripted American soldiers. American sacrifices are for American values. Territorial adjustments in Europe concern us only as they may eliminate future war which may in turn involve us. If the return of Alsace-Lorraine meant that Germany would strive for 50 years to get it back, and in so striving put the world in hazard again, it were better that it remained under the German flag.

When the United States is safe—not when democracy is safe but when the United States is safe—the purpose of this war has been served.

Of course, this great war paper has published interviews by distinguished patriots of Chicago recommending the lynching of statesmen of my build [laughter], and for using the same argument that they use now. We have got a lot of brave fellows in America with their arms in the Treasury clear up to the elbows—fellows who call everybody a traitor who catches them stealing. Their mouths are thoroughly patriotic, but their legs are all pacifist. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, again this great war newspaper has for its leading editorial Thursday, December 6, 1917, a clearly defined and well analyzed statement which shows the difference between fighting for the United States and fighting to help the down-trodden people of some other country. Let me read a few extracts from this truly great editorial:

THE UNITED STATES FIGHTS FOR THE UNITED STATES.

* * * Such things must be left to the individual selection of the citizens, to their consciences and sense of right. A nation must not compel citizens for other than the well-being of the nation to which they owe allegiance. The obligations of a citizen do not extend to other than his own nation. He may elect to further the cause of justice anywhere in the world, to fight for the down-trodden, and to be a champion of the weak, but no government founded upon fairness and trying to do justice to its citizens may force its citizens to give up their lives for other than the well-being and security of their own nation.

Therefore the United States seeks one thing in this war. That is the security of the United States. American volunteers by the million might go to war for Belgium, but no American conscripts could be employed in such a war unless the results of the war for Belgium would affect the United States.

Altruistically and philosophically we may be interested otherwise than as conditions and products of conditions affect the United States, but we can not rightfully conscript soldiers to fight to change conditions that would not affect the United States.

When we are hung with those who thought with us six months ago, we will have a lot of excitement and a lot of editors will be hanging on the other rung. [Laughter.]

I think, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, that you will understand what I mean when I call attention to the difference between giving the lives of our sons for American ideals and the forcing of American youth to settle the ancient wrongs and territorial boundaries of Europe.

The President talks about the restoration of Serbia and that the King must be placed back on his throne. We have not forgotten that Serbia lit the match that set the world afire. We have not forgotten the Serbian hospitality that murdered a man and his wife. We have not forgotten that the Emperor of

Austria made demands upon Serbia which were wicked and outrageous as punishment for these two murders. Both Kings are wrong, neither of them stood for democracy. [Applause.] But again I say to you it is against the American doctrine, it is against the interests of America to entangle itself or endanger its life, the life of this Republic, in seeking to adjust European differences. Both Webster and Clay supported a resolution tendering the sympathy of the United States to Greece in her great struggle for democracy, but both of them disclaimed any idea that it was a part of the American policy to make war on account of that question. This same doctrine is announced in this very newspaper that I have quoted from, that stood so strongly for the declaration of war and stands for the prosecution of war until the causes for which we went to war have been accomplished.

As to Serbia and Belgium, the belligerents agree to return the territory and the amount of money to be paid for restoration is not an American question. Our American lives must not be sacrificed to the juggernaut of a collection agency.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman, if he will permit, when an agreement was ever made to return that territory?

Mr. MASON. The gentleman misunderstood me. I think this is true. This does not come out of my time, Mr. Chairman, because the gentleman from Virginia controls the time, and I have only a few minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. I have only a few minutes' time.

Mr. MASON. Then I will answer you in this way: In substance there can be a meeting on every proposition made by our President, and any man who has studied diplomacy can see that there can be a meeting of the minds of the United States and Germany, except upon the proposition of the surrender by Germany of the control of Alsace-Lorraine; and if I had the time I think I could convince the gentleman of that.

But I insist we are not to be used to collect the money. Our blood is too sacred for that. Let me illustrate as to Belgium. Our allies demand not only a return of territory, but an indemnity. Germany may say, "I will give you one billion." Our friends may say, "We demand five billions." Are we to be still continued in the war year after year to make sure that those four other billions will be collected?

The killing of our sons will not bring back the Belgian sons, and our boys will be of more use to poor Belgium in shop or between the plow handles at home than they will be in European graves. [Applause.]

I insert the messages of our Presidents, beginning with Washington and ending with McKinley and Roosevelt, showing the fixed policy of our Government to keep out of European entanglements. I beg leave to quote first from John Adams's diary in 1782:

It is obvious that all the powers of Europe will be continually maneuvering with us to work us into their imaginary balances of power. They will all wish to make us a make-weight candle when they are weighing out their pounds. Indeed, it is not surprising, for we shall very often, if not always, be able to turn the scale. But I think it ought to be our rule not to meddle, and that of all the powers of Europe not to desire us, or perhaps even to permit us, to interfere if they can help us. The public negotiations and secret intrigues of the English and the French have been employed for centuries in every court and country of Europe. Look back to the history of Spain, Holland, Germany, Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Prussia, Italy, and Turkey for the last hundred years. How many revolutions have been caused! How many emperors and kings have fallen victims to the alternate triumphs of parties excited by Englishmen or Frenchmen! And can we expect to escape the vigilant attention of politicians so experienced, so keen sighted, and so rich? If we convince them that our attachment to neutrality is unchangeable, they will let us alone, but as long as a hope remains in either power of seducing us to engage in war on his side and against his enemy we shall be torn and convinced by his maneuvers.

I also quote from Washington's Farewell Address, 1796:

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Just a few words from Mr. Jefferson to the President in 1823:

I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take an active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war. All their energies are expended in the destruction of the labor, property, and lives of their people. On our part never had a people so favorable a chance of trying the opposite system of peace and fraternity with mankind and the direction of all our means and faculties to the purposes of improvement instead of destruction.

One word from Mr. Madison to Mr. Monroe in 1823:

A participation in (a congress proposed by Mr. Canning for the settlement of the difficulties between Spain and her colonies) would not be likely to make converts to our principles, whilst our admission under the wing of England would take from our consequence what it would add to hers. Such an invitation, nevertheless, will be a mark of respect not without a value, and this will be more enhanced by a polite refusal than by an acceptance, not to mention that an acceptance would be a step leading us into a wildness of politics and a den of conspirators.

And a few words from President Monroe in 1824:

Separated as we are from Europe by the great Atlantic Ocean, we can have no concern in the wars of the European Governments, nor in the causes which produce them.

President John Quincy Adams, in 1826, says:

Compare our situation and the circumstances of that time (that of Washington's Farewell Address) with those of the present day, and what from the very words of Washington then would be his counsels to his countrymen now? Europe has still her set of primary interests, with which we have little or a remote relation. Our distant and detached situation with reference to Europe remains the same.

Mr. Van Buren, Secretary of State, to Mr. Moore, minister to Colombia in 1829:

It is the ancient and well-settled policy of this Government not to interfere with the internal concerns of any foreign country.

A word from Daniel Webster, Secretary of State in 1842:

And the perfecting of this system of communication among nations requires the strictest application of the doctrine of nonintervention.

President Fillmore claimed that in this doctrine of "neutrality and nonintervention the United States have not followed the lead of other civilized nations, but that they have taken the lead themselves and have been followed by others."

I refer you also to Secretary of State Cass, who in 1859 declined to interfere in Mexico, although he sympathized with the constitutional party.

I will not quote further, but recommend to the student of this well-established policy of noninterference Moore's Digest of International Law, volume 6, which includes opinions of many of the Secretaries of State and many of the Presidents, including messages from McKinley and Roosevelt. Just one sentence from President Roosevelt's message in 1904:

Ordinarily it is very much wiser and more useful for us to concern ourselves with striving for our own moral and material betterment here at home than to concern ourselves with trying to better the conditions of things in other nations.

We know we are at war and must go through. What does "go through" mean? We declared war for the freedom of the seas. That is now conceded by all belligerents in all propositions of peace. Does "go through" mean we shall let our children go cold and hungry, our people ground to death by taxation, that Great Britain, our coworker, may keep her "kill"? Shall we fill European graves with American youths that our Japanese coworkers may keep her democratic hold on German colonies?

Are we to continue to bear sacrifices? Are we to continue to bear what our boys yesterday received from a submarine? Are we to decide questions outside of American policies and outside of the interests of the United States?

We will "go through"; we will not stop, even while considering peace; but it is due the President that we let him know how our constituents feel, while he is considering these hard and new diplomatic questions. Every loyal man in America should speak. Some man husking corn in Illinois may have a good idea. Let us have it! Some man in the store, factory, or office may contribute to our needs. Some lone sentinel standing guard at night under the stars may give wisdom to our counsels. This city of Washington has no monopoly on brains and patriotism.

The closing words of the President's last message finds a responsive chord in every American heart. He said:

The hand of God is laid upon the nations. He will show them favor, I devoutly believe, only as they rise to the clear heights of his own justice and mercy.

It is for that mercy that I plead, mercy for the starving millions all over the world, not only for Belgium, France, and Germany, but for the cold and undernourished women and children of our own country; mercy for the American boys who have been forced into sickness and death in a foreign land; mercy for the unhappy mothers of our own land. One friend writes, speaking of his wife and of his son somewhere in France, he says:

Mary sets Jim's place at the table regularly. She knits and prays for him constantly and in the night calls to him in her dreams.

Mr. Chairman, there are hundreds of thousands—a million—Marys—mothers and sisters. They have some rights here. They are not cowards. They are not unwilling to sacrifice in defense of this land. They know, if they have been through

high school, that never before in the history of the United States have Americans been conscripted to settle ancient questions pending between other nations. They know as well as you and I that what our dear country has done for democracy outside of the United States, has been done by example and not by the sword. When the Bastille fell Lafayette sent the key to Washington. In no compensation for the sword, but on account of the illustrious example. The Statue of Liberty in the New York Harbor, was given by the French not because in their war with Great Britain we violated neutrality as laid down by Washington but because in all their struggle for self-government, when they made reprisal in one day for a century of kingly wrongs, they were fighting in the light of the American Declaration of Independence. In that light and by reason of our example, England, against whom we rebelled, has broadened into a constitutional government.

Kossuth, the Hungarian patriot, said here in Washington that in all his struggles he had before him our Declaration of Independence. Bolivar, who laid the foundation of self-government in South America, said he was led by the light of our Declaration of Independence, and all of the little republics that have sprung up and are prospering under the rule of self-government do it in imitation of the splendid example of our fathers and without the aid of the American sword.

I know that if you ask your constituents how they feel upon this question of giving American boys to settle a real estate title in Europe you will be branded as a pacifist, possibly as a traitor. Ask your people, and then let our President know. People are not for peace at any price, but for peace with honor.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we went to war with an open declaration that we wanted no vengeance, no indemnities, but a demand for our ships—the freedom of the seas. That demand is answered by every proposition of peace made by all the belligerents conceding the freedom of the seas.

I believe that answer has been conceded by every proposition as to the terms of peace. We have had that victory. We have had a greater victory. We have seen the time come when the Kaiser has been obliged to consult the Reichstag before getting a man to accept the chancellorship of the Imperial Government of Germany. And I say to you, friends and colleagues, that the quicker we talk truthfully and fairly with our constituents, and the sooner we let the President know how the people feel about these things, the sooner we will have an honorable peace. Do not be afraid of being called a traitor or a pacifist. The people of all the world want peace, and it will come. Christ was a pacifist.

And seeing the multitudes He went up into a mountain, and when He was set His disciples came unto Him, and He opened His mouth and taught them, saying:

"Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy."

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

[Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is recognized for 20 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, at a time like this, when the whole world is at war and when there are statements made from responsible authorities, especially holding responsible positions in the Congress of the United States, that raise questions of whether we are utilizing all of our powers to the best of our ability, it is rather a serious matter for anyone to offer anything that might seem to be criticism. When the war got in full motion I was somewhat concerned whether any criticism ought to be offered at all. I realized that no one ought to say anything that might give comfort to the enemy. So about 10 days ago, upon my own invitation and solicitation, I had an interview with one of America's greatest engineers, whom I happened to know personally very well, and I asked him whether, in his judgment, we were lax in what we were doing in the matter of war machinery. He said to me very frankly that the first thing that was needed is a large vision, so that we might comprehend what we were called upon to do, and also a facility that could utilize in detail our wonderful resources which were at hand. He took a piece of paper and graphically illustrated to me what he thought could be done and should be done by requiring a weekly checking up of all the war activities to insure coordination to avoid what seems to me the result of inefficient methods so apparent to anyone who is willing to look at the facts squarely. I frankly say to you that the interview was sought because of the coal order of Mr. Garfield that indicated to me that we lacked from the outset a full comprehension of the situation on the one side, and a marked inefficiency in management on the other.

Mr. Chairman, I asked for time enough to have read to the committee one of the most illuminating and informing statements, not from the pen of the engineer whom I have mentioned, but from a staff writer of one of the greatest Democratic newspapers in the world, in which the condition as it exists to-day is most graphically pointed out in a spirit of helpfulness and not of criticism, conceding the greatness of the problem presented by the war as well as the great work that already has been done by the War Department, but also the most remarkable fertility in suggestion of what ought to be done now that is not being done. Here is a good example of what character of criticism should be employed, pointing out the weakness, the reason why, and the method of correction. I therefore am going to ask the Clerk to read in my time one of the fairest and most able statements bearing directly upon this situation about which Senators have spoken during the past few days and to-day one of our distinguished colleagues has addressed the House. I ask Members to pay special attention to it because of its fairness and its wholesome criticism, and especially the suggestions by which we could have avoided what we are now suffering.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Feb. 3, 1918.]

AMERICA'S HIT-OR-MISS WAR METHODS—CRITICISM OF THE SYSTEM CONTINUES AT WASHINGTON, BUT IT HAS SHIFTED TO A BROADER BASIS—LACK OF REAL COORDINATION ON SCIENTIFIC LINES.

Criticism of the War Department has not stopped with Secretary Baker's defense of the charges brought against his administration, as convincing as that defense was in certain parts. But the line of attack seems to be shifted from the multitude of "details of delay," as the Secretary called them, to what is supposed to be the underlying cause of the country's troubles in getting ready for war.

The newer form of criticism is remarkably free from an appearance of partisanship. It is not captious. It passes beyond overcoats and blankets and lack of hospital facilities to a greater fundamental lack, of which all the miscellaneous defects have been the inevitable results—the lack of an organization working on a basis of ascertained facts and on the engineering methods indispensable to quantity production. This diagnosis of the difficulty comes from the engineers and the experts working within the Government, some of them in the War Department itself, who make a point of finding no fault with what is wrong without being ready to suggest a remedy.

It is a matter of professional ethics with them not to uncover a hole before they know how to fill it up. They take into full account the great things Mr. Baker has accomplished in their outline of methods by which he might have accomplished more. But they take in departments other than the War Department in their criticism, for they say Mr. Baker alone could not have done much more than he has done without cooperation of other war activities. His failure to get such cooperation is attributed more to his course as chairman of the Council of National Defense than to his administration strictly within the lines of his own department.

Military preparation, industrial preparation, rail transportation, ship tonnage, coal production, and so on, have never marched in step with each other for a moment since the beginning of the war, and at this moment the country is suffering from an industrial jam. The jam has been growing since last summer, and even in its early stages it was sufficient to account for a large part of the delay in having soldiers properly equipped.

The country has talked a great deal about this being an industrial war, a conflict of factory power, of food production. The phrases themselves have become hackneyed before the public has learned what they mean. The word "coordination" has been worked threadbare in the oratory and the private discussion of the war. But there has been no coordination comprehensive enough to keep all the activities in touch with each other. The war machine has done too much of this and too little of that, has gone ahead too fast on some things and lagged too far behind on others, apparently oblivious to the fact that many of the things produced by speeding up were useless impedimenta until they could be used in connection with the things in the production of which there has been delay.

Such, in brief summary, is the criticism of the engineers of production, not merely of the War Department, but of the entire administration of the business of war.

"This war," said one of these engineering experts the other day in commenting on what he had seen from the inside, "should be a matter of quantity production, perfected as to the assembling of parts and not an accomplished fact until the finished product is delivered at the point where it is to be used. The finished product we have in mind is an American Army equipped for this sort of a war and delivered for use in France. The wide diversity of the industries and activities entering into the enterprise should not blind us to the fact that they are all vital parts of the same undertaking and that they should be in tune with each other as to time of delivery and putting together."

The training of every soldier in every American camp and cantonment has a direct bearing on the mining of every ton of coal, the shearing of every sheep, the making of every pair of shoes, of every rifle, and with the laying down of every keel for a merchant ship. A regiment of soldiers held at an American port of embarkation because there is no troopship for them is of no use to France, no matter how well equipped it may be. A heap of blankets piled up in the factory because they can not be shipped are of no use to a lot of shivering soldiers in a remote camp, no matter how well the item of the blankets may look in a list of things that the Government has bought and paid for. There are no restorative qualities for a sick soldier in the cantonment contractor's blue-print plan of a base hospital. Gun carriages rushed ahead into the jam of commodities at the terminals long before there are guns for them will not help in the production of an American barrage on the west front. And so it goes, through all the long list of the parts to be produced for the finished product delivered and ready for use in France.

"Without forgetting for a moment that the American soldier is a human being with a soul and the inspiration of patriotism and loyalty, we must, for the purposes of this problem, think of him as a commodity as we think of his rifle as a commodity. The soldiers in the aggregate—that is, the man power—are also a commodity. So is railroad transpor-

tation and sea transportation and storage space, as well as all the munitions and supplies. They are all useless unless brought together at the right time and at the right place. With its present organization the War Department, and the Government as a whole, has no adequate means for the assembling and the delivery of its product, no matter how much partial excellence or efficiency there may be in this or that separate line of the whole work.

"There is no way to accomplish such assembly and delivery other than the engineering way of treating the whole thing scientifically as a piece of quantity production, with one executive with full authority over all. The appointment of Mr. Stettinius as surveyor general of supplies does not give us the solution by any means. The man is all right; he has so proved himself in a place of real authority as supply purchaser in America for our allies, but the job made for him in our war administration is all wrong. He can survey and advise, but he can not do. He can be only one more barrier in the thick line of entanglements between our Army and the one man who has real authority, the President.

"It is not difficult to imagine even now what will happen when a man like Stettinius, without real power, tries to get results by persuasion from a man like Quartermaster General Goethals, if the two do not happen to agree. We will have another Goethals-Denman situation, with nothing accomplished.

"Goethals, too, is a powerful man in a place that has not got sufficient power, for no matter how aggressive he may be in getting supplies produced, he has no authority to control all the activities necessary to get those supplies assembled and where they belong at the moment they are needed. And there is nobody above him who has that power. With all his engineering skill, Goethals never could have dug the Panama Canal if he had not had full authority over many things essential to the digging.

"To be more specific, we need, literally, a quantity-production chart in the War Department that will enable some man to see every day and every hour just where we are in every activity, and that man must have authority to say, 'Hold back there'; 'Speed up here.' We have no such chart anywhere in the War Department or any other department.

"The Government, through its War Department, should assemble in front of that chart a board consisting of its Quartermaster General, its Chief of Ordnance, its Chief of Aviation, its Chief Engineer Officer, the Director General of Railroads, the Chief of Embarkation, a chief in control of labor supply, the head of the Shipping Board, the Fuel Administrator—in short, every chief executive who has control of the production of a commodity or a force that is vital to the prosecution of the war. Over all these there should be a chief with absolute power and answerable only to the President. And, subject only to this chief, the authority of each man on the board should be absolute in the production and purchase of the particular commodity or force for which he is held responsible. The time and quantity and delivery factors in the production of each of them must be determined by the chief of the board, acting solely with reference to what the chart shows the needs of the whole enterprise to be. There you would have your war production board and your priority board in one body, as they should be. It is impossible to make two controls, one for priority and one for production.

"An engineer's chart for such a purpose is the familiar thing of horizontal and vertical lines, the most graphic, illuminating thing in the world for trained executives, but something not sufficiently valued by idealists whose far vision interferes with their seeing the foreground difficulties in the road which they must travel to get where they want to go. But the chart has one line, at least, that is ideal. It is the vertical line on the extreme right of the picture. It shows the goal, what it is hoped to attain at a given time. It alone is not enough to hang a working plan on. The other vertical lines show the divisions of time into weeks, beginning with the line at the extreme left of the picture, which stands for the present moment, and then placed at equal intervals across the chart, approaching always to the right-hand line of the supreme achievement.

"The horizontal lines represent every line of production, of commodity or power that is to go into the finished product, the combination of all the products to be delivered in France for use at a given time; in other words, the American Army. The horizontal lines must be extended from left to right every week to show just what has been accomplished in each activity. In that way the production and priority board with its controlling chief will see at least once a week, in one true picture, just what is behind, just what is ahead, and will know what to lag and what to speed so that all these horizontal lines may proceed across the chart toward the vertical of the ideal, with some approach to a company-front formation.

"Take a simple hypothetical case for illustration. Suppose the horizontal line showing the assembling of man power in the camps is shooting too far ahead of the horizontal line that shows the production and delivery of overcoats and getting to the vertical line that marks a week in midwinter, while the overcoat line is only approaching a vertical line of late autumn. The chart will actually show the discrepancy. If the member of the board responsible for overcoats is not able to catch up immediately, the member of the board responsible for bringing men to camp is told by the chief of them all to lag the process of assembling men until the business of protecting them against cold and disease can be brought up to where it should be.

"What actually has happened in place of such coordination and working with ascertained facts has been a hit-or-miss method of carrying on the various processes without reference to the progress of each other and in accordance with hoped-for facts at some period in the future. It was decided to have so many soldiers at certain places at certain times. It was known that they would need overcoats, blankets, and warm uniforms at a certain time. Contracts were awarded for such equipment, and for a brief period of mild weather early in the days of National Army mobilization the country reveled in the statistics put out by the Bureau of Public Information on the millions of this, that, and the other thing contracted for. But the people who were getting the men together never knew at what rate the clothing that had been contracted for was being produced and delivered. The discrepancy between men and supplies was not realized till the former needed the latter and the latter was not forthcoming in sufficient quantity. A production and a priority board working with a chart would have avoided that situation.

"Alongside the quantity-production chart I would hang a map of the United States. It is fair to assume from the muddle we are in that such a map has not been studied sufficiently. Because of that neglect and of the lack of the comprehensive plan for quantity production we are now suffering from an industrial jam that is holding back every phase of war work. We have not called it by its right name yet. We have called it a coal shortage, which only suggests a part of the story. There was a coal shortage because of congestion of transportation and

there was congestion of transportation because all freight trains and all coal trains were headed in the same direction to the same two or three ports of embarkation when we had a dozen other ports that were practically idle.

"The holding up of an entire fleet of supply ships on this side of the Atlantic loaded with goods needed abroad, because they could not be coaled, could have been avoided by having some of those ships loaded at the South Atlantic and Gulf ports. We would not have had the rail congestion if half of the commodities rushed to northern ports in a struggle of conflicting priority orders, and piled up on docks and in warehouses, had been sent over other routes to the southern ports. We would not have had the 15 workless days' order if the jam it was intended to relieve had been avoided by a scientific zoning system, whereby all of our rail and port facilities could have been used to the utmost.

"This discussion of the industrial jam and the flow back to the factories and the coal shortage and the need of a zoning system is all relevant to the matter of a production and priority board and a production chart, because the Director General of Railroads and the Fuel Administrator should be members of such a board and under orders of its chief, for without the fuel and the transportation the whole thing falls down."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a minute to say that the statement which has just been read to me is a capital comment on a situation in which we now find ourselves, and it is also a recommendation of a sane method of relieving it. It is not crimination or recrimination. Its virtue lies in the strength of detection of wrongs and the substitution of remedies which know no personal pique, but strives only for public good. I do not believe that any member of the committee or the House can be justly charged with either careless conduct or willful motive who refuses to close his eyes to wrongs and demands that they be speedily righted. Neither will he be subject to any unpleasant criticism for pointing out what is known to exist which ought not to be and recommending something that can and should be. It is far better than any personal attack or meaningless generality urged against the statements of facts as to the condition of the War Department, which up to this time, so far as I can see, have not been answered.

Mr. Chairman, this raises what is now a leading question before the country. There seems to be an attempt to silence all criticism of methods now in vogue in the War Department. The charge is made that criticism in time of war is unpatriotic if not treasonable. Those who have pointed out specific facts of weakness are charged with bad motives. Epithets have been hurled against them as ignorant, demagogic, and lacking in love of country.

Mr. Chairman, innuendo is not argument, neither is sarcasm logic; neither is condemnation of a bad system answered by personal abuse of the one making the condemnation. Not all the invective of our modern Mirabeaus, nor all the impassioned oratory of our Patrick Henrys, nor all the eulogies of our Websters, graphically detailing the wonders and grandeur of our establishments, will answer the unvarnished and simple record of sickness and death of our youth called to the colors who have thus paid the penalty of national inefficiency before ever having the honor to fire a shot in defense of their country's honor, nor the hit-and-miss methods which see complete paralysis of the Nation's resources in the face of its greatest crisis. Such fatalities when the result of conditions uncontrolled or uncontrollable will be overlooked by the American people; but when controllable and yet defended on the basis that there have been no unnecessary blunders, in the face of the most startling testimony of conditions that must not be permitted to exist, the country will demand an accounting, and that soon. Instead of our silencing all criticism upon the assumption that all that can be known in war we know, and all that can be done we have done, the country's responsible administration should recognize its inefficiency and be willing to accept constructive criticism in the interest not only of a united country but of an efficient government capable and willing to make any sacrifice necessary to do and to die for national honor.

Undivided council is wisely sought when based upon freedom of expression by men of ability and responsibility, but it is the height of unwisdom if the result of either mediocrity or servility. In this supreme crisis this Congress must hold itself bound to commend the good and responsible and to condemn the bad. Otherwise the country will and should demand its place given over to men who will exercise this responsibility. This war must be fought to a successful ending, otherwise the blood and treasure will be in vain. I wish again to commend a study of the salient recommendations of the constructive builder, the engineer, in the confidence that improvements will be made even though their suggestion may come from those not in official circles and offered without solicitation, but in the interest of a common cause which must depend upon our very best of resource. Let the country lift its gaze for a moment from what it has done and take one glance at what it has not yet done but must soon do.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. KNUTSON.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, on the 7th day of January I addressed this House upon conditions as I found them at Camp Cody, N. Mex. As the result of my remarks the governor of Minnesota directed the safety commission of that State to visit Camp Cody and other camps where Minnesota soldiers are encamped and make a first-hand investigation. I desire at this time to send to the desk a report made by that commission on its return, which I ask to be read by the Clerk and printed in the RECORD. To this report I desire to supplement by inserting a portion of the report submitted to Gov. Harding, of Iowa, by the committee named by him to investigate the great number of complaints received as to the unfitness of the location occupied by Camp Cody for training purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT ON CAMP CODY, DEMING, N. MEX., AND OTHER CAMPS.

Camp Cody is located at Deming, N. Mex. Three railroads, the Southern Pacific, the El Paso & Southwestern, and the Santa Fe, run into the city. Its population immediately before the establishment of Camp Cody was 3,000. Its present number of inhabitants is estimated at more than 6,000. The altitude is approximately 4,300 feet. The air in this locality is very dry. The rainfall is less than 12 inches annually. The sun shines on about 320 days of the year. There are no flies, mosquitoes, or insects of any kind, and the water is excellent. The temperature varies greatly. The nights are cool and the days are usually quite warm. During the winter months the temperature of the night and day ranges from 30° F. to 80° F. and during the summer months from 40° F. to 90° F., showing a difference of 50° between the day and night.

CONDITIONS IN CITY.

On account of the crowded conditions at Deming it is difficult for visitors to procure rooms, but through the kindness of the residents many houses of the city have been opened to those who can not be accommodated at the hotels. Local organizations are doing everything within their power to accommodate those visiting the camp. From a moral standpoint conditions could scarcely be better than they are at Deming. There is excellent cooperation between local authorities and the military police in the enforcement of the laws. Very few venereal diseases have developed since the location of the camp. The sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited. The comparatively small size of the city makes it possible to detect and eliminate prostitution. Such organizations as the Young Men's Christian Association, the Knights of Columbus, and the churches of the city make provision for religious services. A local war board, known as the Deming War Service Board, which is doing good work in many lines, has been formed to assist in promoting wholesome recreation and entertainment for the soldiers.

CONDITION OF CAMP GROUND.

The ground upon which the camp is located is very sandy, and the dust and sand where the Minnesota boys drill are several inches deep. Nearly every man spoken to criticized the location on this account. It was said that the air at times becomes so filled with this sandy dust as to almost completely obstruct one's vision. The floors of the tents and buildings become covered with it in such quantities that it is impossible for the men to keep their quarters clean. On days when the wind is not blowing and the men are not drilling the air is clear and agreeable. Those living in the city would not be affected to as great an extent by the dust as are the soldiers, who must drill daily and who by marching through it are continually raising and inhaling it.

CONVENIENCES AND SANITARY CONDITIONS.

The capacity of the camp is approximately 30,000 men. The present number located there is 24,867. The tents are 14 by 14. Some of the Minnesota companies had eight men in each tent, but orders have been issued to reduce the number to five as soon as sufficient tents arrive. The water supply of the camp is good, but the sewerage is not what it ought to be. The open system has been installed for drainage purposes. The toilet facilities are very poor. Incinerators are used to dispose of all kitchen waste and such other matter as can be burned. The tents are heated by the burning of wood in small stoves. The lighting system for the most part is very inadequate. Electric lights were found in the hospitals, officers' tents, and mess halls, but candles, which were furnished for illuminating the tents of the men, did not give sufficient light. It was also reported that there was an insufficient amount of hose for extinguishing fires that might occur.

FOOD AND ORDNANCE.

The subsistence was very adequate. No complaints were made as to the meals in the mess halls. The men in most cases had sufficient uniforms and the facilities for cleaning their clothing were ample. About 75 per cent of the men were fully equipped with rifles, belts, and other required ordnance. The Minnesota Field Artillery Regiment had not been provided with sufficient field-artillery equipment.

NUMBER OF DOCTORS.

There are several infirmaries for the incipient cases and one base hospital composed of several buildings. The hospitals were of the pavilion type. There are 174 physicians and 33 dentists in the camp. If all the physicians were available for medical service, the proportion of doctors to the number of men would be approximately 1 to 143, and the proportion of doctors to the number of sick would be 1 to 47. Actually the proportion attending the sick is only about 1 doctor to 40 patients, as most of the doctors are engaged in administrative and other work.

NURSES.

There are 49 registered woman nurses. The proportion of these nurses to the number of sick is about 1 to 24. There are 323 male attendants at the hospital, and 1,546 privates in the Hospital Corps, most of whom are available for service, but inexperienced in this kind of work. The camp is in great need of more graduate nurses.

HOSPITAL EQUIPMENT.

The hospital lacks adequate sewerage, as the hospital buildings are not equipped with baths and other necessary plumbing fixtures. Improvements are being contemplated and some new materials to be used for this purpose are now on the ground. None of the wards appeared to be equipped with diet kitchens, essential to the serving of food in the best manner. The men in certain wards, such as the erysipelas ward, are too crowded. Nearly every sick Minnesota man visited

said he received very kind and efficient treatment from both doctors and nurses. There was very little complaint about the hospital food or clothing. A few said that the food was cold and unfit to eat, and one or two stated that the quantity was not sufficient.

SICK AND DEATH RATE.

The total number of men at the camp at the time of our visit, as above stated, was 24,867. The total number in hospital and quarantine was 1,191, which, of course, includes many who were not seriously ill. The sick rate was 43 per thousand. This is the lowest since camp was organized. The maximum was 64 per thousand for the week ending January 4, 1918. The total number of deaths from all causes since the opening of the camp was 83. With the continuation of this proportion for one year, the annual death rate will be about eight per thousand.

KINDS OF DISEASES.

The different and prevailing kinds of diseases and the number afflicted therewith were as follows:

| | Total in hospital on Jan. 18. | Total number cases from Aug. 25, 1917, to Jan. 18, 1918. |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Pneumonia..... | 138 | 242 |
| Measles..... | 33 | 1,554 |
| Scarlet fever..... | 9 | |
| Erysipelas..... | 34 | 90 |
| Acute otitis (ear infection)..... | 43 | 136 |
| Fleury..... | 45 | 61 |
| Rheumatic fever..... | 190 | 300 |
| Meningitis..... | 2 | |
| Chicken pox..... | 2 | |
| Surgical cases..... | 175 | |
| Venereal..... | 32 | |
| Unclassified..... | 438 | |

VENEREAL DISEASES.

Only about 2½ per cent of the 24,867 men are reported to have been afflicted with venereal diseases. A total of 41 had syphilis before going to the camp. No new syphilis cases were reported since camp was established. Six hundred and thirty-eight men had other venereal diseases before arrival at Deming. Only 19 cases were developed at Camp Cody up to January 1 this year. Reports, therefore, relative to the venereal disease situation have been greatly exaggerated.

OFFICERS.

The commanding general and his staff are very efficient and doing excellent work. There was some evidence to the effect that certain officers were manifesting a spirit of exclusiveness which tended to create a dissatisfied feeling on the part of those in the ranks. Such attitude on the part of the officers should be eliminated. This is poor time for the showing of such autocratic spirit. The medical officers in charge of the hospitals and performing other duties are high-class men. They are, however, working under certain handicaps, such as the inconveniences herein referred to, the difficulties due to the sand and dust, and the extreme variation between night and day temperatures, together with the lowered vitality of the soldiers occasioned by the necessary intensive training, to which most of the men were not accustomed before entering the camp.

COMPARISON BETWEEN DIFFERENT CAMPS.

The comparison of conditions at Camp Cody with others, such as those at Camp Kearney, near San Diego, Cal.; Fort Winfield Scott, in San Francisco; Camp Lewis, at American Lake, Wash.; Camp Pike, Little Rock, Ark.; Jefferson Barracks, St. Louis, Mo.; and Camp Dodge, Des Moines, Iowa, shows that the hospital and equipment at Camp Cody have been neglected by the responsible authorities. The hospital buildings at Camp Cody were inferior to those in other camps. At Camp Pike, however, some wards were overcrowded. As heretofore stated, the plumbing and sewerage facilities at the Deming camp are entirely inadequate and incomplete, while those of the other camps appeared to be adequate and complete. In all places visited, except Camp Cody, the diet kitchens were equipped so that they could be used for cooking and heating purposes, enabling the attendants to serve warm and proper food to the patients at all times. Except at Camp Cody, electric lights were furnished to all the men. At Camp Kearney no artificial heat is required. At Camp Lewis and Camp Pike the barracks are provided with steam heat. At Camp Cody each hospital ward has a hot-air furnace at each end of the ward, and the tents of the men are heated with stoves. The wood used in them must be shipped in from long distances, and apparently much expense is necessary. The operating rooms of the other hospitals were generally superior to those at Camp Cody, being more commodious, better lighted, and more elaborately equipped. The same can be said of the dental departments. Certain complaints about conditions at Jefferson Barracks were due to the overcrowded condition, which continued for one week. The capacity of the barracks is 4,500, while the number there for a short time was 16,000, but now reduced to less than 4,500.

COMPARISON OF HEALTH CONDITIONS.

In comparing the different localities as to health conditions it is apparent that the contagious diseases are found in about the same proportion. There is very little difference, proportionately, in the number of men who contract venereal diseases after they reach the camp. When, however, one considers such serious illnesses as pneumonia, acute otitis, inflammatory rheumatism, and erysipelas the comparison between the camps on the Pacific slope and Camp Cody, Camp Pike, and Camp Dodge makes it appear that the climatic and other local conditions have some effect in causing these particular diseases.

PNEUMONIA.

At Camp Cody there are now 188 men out of 24,867 afflicted with pneumonia. In Camp Kearney there are 61 men out of 25,000. At Fort Winfield Scott there is 1 out of 2,930. In Camp Lewis there are 35 out of about 34,000. There are therefore proportionately more than three times as many suffering from pneumonia at Camp Cody than at any one of the places on the western coast. At Camp Pike, however, the number of pneumonia cases was larger by far than at any other camp.

RHEUMATISM.

In Camp Cody there were 190 men out of 24,867 afflicted with rheumatism. At Camp Kearney only 15 out of 25,000. There were no cases reported at either Fort Winfield Scott or Camp Lewis.

ACUTE OTITIS.

Of those suffering with acute otitis (ear infection) there were 43 at Camp Cody and only a very few, following measles, at Camp Kearney. At Fort Winfield Scott there was one and none was reported at Camp Lewis.

ERYSIPELAS.

We found 34 erysipelas cases at Camp Cody, 3 at Camp Kearney, and none was reported at Fort Winfield Scott, and only 6 at Camp Lewis.

DEATHS.

The number of deaths at Camp Pike exceed the number at any of the other camps. The total number was not given to the members of the committee visiting this camp. At Camp Cody 83 men have died since the opening of the camp. At Camp Kearney, which opened about the same time with an equal number of men, 60 have died. At Fort Winfield Scott, out of the 2,900 drafted and recruited men located there, there were 2 deaths in the one month during which they have been stationed at this fort. At Camp Lewis, with the largest number of men, there have been 50 deaths.

DEDUCTIONS.

From these figures one is led to believe that the dust and sand, the high altitude, and extreme variation of day and night temperatures at Camp Cody are more conducive to pneumonia, rheumatism, acute otitis, and possibly erysipelas than the climatic conditions on the Pacific coast.

THE EFFECT ON PNEUMONIA, ACUTE OTITIS, AND RHEUMATIC FEVER.

The dust and sand, which irritates the nostrils and throat, causing tonsillitis and bronchial affections, appear to be the source in a large measure of pneumonia, acute otitis, and rheumatic fever. The inhabitants of Deming, who have resided there for years, have not been afflicted with these diseases to any great extent, but the residents are acclimated and do not come into contact with the dust and sand to the same degree as do the soldiers, who, as has already been stated, by their marching in large bodies are continually raising this fine sandy dust and compelled to inhale it.

THE EFFECT ON VARIATION IN TEMPERATURE.

The great variation between day and night temperatures, due to the high altitude, may also be responsible in a large measure for pneumonia and the bad throat conditions which are direct precedents of acute otitis and inflammatory rheumatism. The cold nights spent in tents by men who, during the day, have been very warm must have a bad effect upon their health. The unusually large number of cases of acute otitis and also of rheumatic fever which constitutes one of the most distressing and often permanently disabling of all diseases can be accounted for only by reason of the excessive number of tonsillitis cases due in all probability to the causes hereinbefore stated.

ERYSIPELAS.

Since the opening of the camp there have been 90 cases of erysipelas among the men. It is impossible to say why so many should have been afflicted with this disease unless in this connection also the sand and dust cause an irritation of the nose and face, which thus opens an avenue for infection. It is of course recognized that erysipelas is a contagious disease and the grouping together of so many men might also be responsible for this epidemic.

CONCLUSION AS TO CAUSE OF DISEASE.

While the medical men at Deming differ as to which condition is the greatest factor in causing the prevailing illnesses, it is our opinion that conditions heretofore stated must be responsible in a large measure for the great number of those diseases, which are found at Deming to a greater extent than elsewhere.

SOME OBJECTION TO ANY CLIMATE.

We heard of some objection to the climate in all the camps we visited except at Camp Kearney. At Deming it was the dust. At Fort Winfield Scott it was fogs. At Camp Lewis it was the rain, which has been falling nearly every day for months. At Camp Pike it was slush. At Camp Dodge it was snow and cold. There appear, however, not to be such bad results in the West as the diseases herein indicated as at Camp Cody and in some of the other camps. The Minnesota boys at Fort Winfield Scott were especially pleased with the San Francisco climate and with the conditions generally at this fort. About 96 Minnesota men were discharged on the day of our visit because of physical disability. The officers in charge complained on account of the negligent examination of the men by local doctors. At Camp Kearney, near San Diego, Cal., we heard nothing but favorable comments about the climatic situation. Since the opening of the camp the men there had not lost one hour on account of weather conditions.

UNLESS CONDITIONS ARE REMEDIED REMOVAL IS RECOMMENDED.

Our soldiers who are willing to make the supreme sacrifice are entitled to the best location that can be found. To refuse to select a proper and healthy site for their training, or to fail to keep the established camps in a sanitary condition, would be criminal negligence meriting the severest punishment possible. The largest number of Minnesota troops is located at Camp Cody. There are some at Camp Pike and a smaller number in San Francisco. Unless the sickness at Camp Pike can be reduced, and unless something can be done at Camp Cody to eliminate the dust by the adequate oiling of all the streets and the open ground of the whole camp, or to relieve in some other way the serious and disagreeable conditions above referred to, the troops should, in our opinion, be moved from these places to Camp Kearney, where there are ample facilities for locating a new camp and for the training of hundreds of thousands of men, if necessary, with proportionately much less expense and with greater possibilities for the saving of life and the prevention of disease.

J. A. A. BURNQUIST,
Governor and Chairman of Minnesota
Commission of Public Safety,
CHAS. H. MARCH,
Vice Chairman of Minnesota Commission
of Public Safety,
LYNDON A. SMITH,
Attorney General of Minnesota,
WALTER F. RHINOW,
Adjutant General of Minnesota,
O. W. HOLCOMB, M. D.,
St. Paul, Minn.

CODY CONDITIONS BETTERED—INVESTIGATORS REPORT IMPROVEMENT AT CAMP—SITE, ONLY, IS UNFAVORABLE—KENNEDY AND JEPSON, APPOINTED BY GOV. HARDING, FILE STATEMENT OF FINDINGS DURING VISIT TO NEW MEXICO ENCAMPMENT.

Administration of Army affairs at Camp Cody, Deming, N. Mex., where hundreds of Sioux City soldiers are stationed, yesterday was given the official "O. K." of the mission of investigators sent from Sioux City to Deming by Gov. W. L. Harding.

Only the location of the camp was criticized in the 10-page report which was submitted by J. L. Kennedy and Dr. William Jepson, the investigators, to the Sioux City chapter of the Red Cross and to the governor, and the criticism of that was moderately phrased as "not the most ideal."

The investigators noted a marked improvement in the condition in the camp and blamed the system rather than officers in charge for the situation as it existed there several weeks ago.

TEXT OF THE REPORT.

The report follows:

"To his excellency W. L. HARDING, governor of Iowa:

"Pursuant of your instructions under date of January 14, we proceeded to Camp Cody, at Deming, N. Mex., arriving there on the 20th instant, and the following morning undertook the inspection of the camp, having first received the consent of the commanding officer, Gen. Blockson, who placed at our disposal every opportunity to make such investigation as we deemed necessary in the fulfillment of our mission.

"In the fulfillment of our mission as set forth in your instructions we were guided by the impression that it was your desire that our investigation should be carried on with a view of determining the existence of conditions inimical to the health and welfare of the troops stationed at the camp.

"Social environment: The social environment of the camps, in so far as furnishing any factor deleterious to the morale or health of the troops, is all that could be well asked for. The city of Deming, with a population not in excess of 3,000, would normally present but a limited opportunity for vice, except such as would directly surround the liquor traffic. As trafficking in liquor has been abolished in the city and strict regulations exist against its introduction into camp, the amount of liquor finding its way to the troops must be limited to that which can be clandestinely introduced, and this, by reason of the care exercised to prevent it, must be most limited in quantity. Similarly, every effort is apparently exercised to prevent contact with such of the opposite sex as would lead to moral deterioration, which statement is supported by the records of the division surgeon's office, which shows that of 679 cases of venereal disease appearing among the troops, 660 were contracted in civil life and 19 from exposure since arrival at the camp, and over one-half of said 19 cases—namely, 12—occurred during the first month of the mobilization, a period when the machinery of protection had not reached its maximum of efficiency. In the light of the foregoing facts, it is believed that it may well be questioned if an equal number of men anywhere are leading a more moral life than the troops at this camp, certainly nowhere in civil life. The Y. M. C. A. and K. C. organizations and provided buildings at the camp supply the men with the needed recreational amusements. Such as were visited by us were well filled and the entertainment of good quality.

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.

"Camp site: The camp is located in a level valley, altitude about 4,300 feet, surrounded by low ranges of mountains distant some 15 to 30 miles and more. The soil is composed largely of sand, much of which is shifted from place to place by the winds, which at times leads to such clouds of dust as to obscure from view only objects a short distance away, in consequence of which troop movements at times must be temporarily suspended. Personally, we had no opportunity of observing these sandstorms, but all oral evidence was to that effect, while the drifts of the fine sand about the sparse vegetation of mesquite and Yucca plants gave evidence of this sand movement; furthermore, the depths to which vehicles and the feet of men and animals penetrated the sand in many places gave evidence of the great sand and dust movement possible.

"That at times the sand and dust-laden air is a factor to some degree detrimental to the health of the troops seems to us a reasonable assumption based upon the fact that workers in dust in civil life are well recognized to be especially prone to pulmonary affections, pneumonia, bronchitis, in consequence of the damage done to pulmonary structures by the particles of foreign substances inhaled.

FLYING SAND CONTAMINATED.

"If the sand and dust is contaminated by pathogenic germs, the same may constitute an added factor of pathogenicity. That the soil must be contaminated from time to time by the excreta of animals and men when away from camp on maneuvers goes without saying, and as there has been no rainfall in amount sufficient to carry the organic material and germs away in surface water or into the soil to a depth where no longer capable of being carried about by the currents of air, the accumulations of five months, less such as have been destroyed by the sun's action, must at this time be present in the ever-shifting sand and dust.

"While the sun's action may suffice for the soil sterilization in the heated months of summer, it seems to us questionable whether the same holds true of the cooler months of winter.

"To the conception upon our part of sand infection and consequent aid infection at such times when moderate currents are produced, we would attribute in part the apparent tendency to infections in and about the respiratory tract.

"The question as of the degree of aid infection we reserve for a supplemental report.

CLIMATIC CONDITIONS IN CAMP.

"There is apparently nothing in the climatic conditions which would exercise a deleterious effect, unless it be the marked difference between diurnal and nocturnal temperatures increased in its effect by the rarity of the air, making it difficult for the men to adjust their clothing requirements to the changing needs.

"This difficulty would be accentuated when the men are undergoing marked physical exercise, especially at this altitude, as it is probably performed with more difficulty than in lower altitudes. The practically constant sunshine and aridity are in themselves beneficial.

"The water supply is abundant and of the best quality.

"Food: Our report upon the food, its preparation and serving, is based upon an examination of organizations selected at random by us. In our opinion, ample and wholesome food is issued to the men, perish-

able food being stored in company refrigerators after use. The food is well prepared by company cooks, who have been instructed in their duties, which is served to the men in mess halls, well heated and ventilated and equipped for the purpose. The food, as to quality and quantity, preservation and serving must leave little, if anything, to be desired, and nothing in connection therewith can act deleteriously to the health of the men.

QUARTERS OF THE SOLDIERS.

"The men's quarters consist of pyramidal tents, floored and with sides boarded up, heated with Sibley stoves, and adequately ventilated. Five men are quartered in each tent, which can not be in excess of the number which hygienic requirements would impose. Each man is now provided with a cot and four blankets, which number appears to be adequate to meet the men's needs in this respect. Inquiry of many men as to the adequacy of the bedding allowance elicited no complaints unless it be that the issue of additional blankets from time to time to meet the increasing needs with increasing cold was unduly tardy. We are of the opinion that the men can suffer but little, if any, from deficient shelter or bed clothing. There is, however, a possibility that the men may subject themselves to conditions in their tents which are not conducive to the greatest safeguarding of their health, in that they maintain heat in their tents until ready to retire, and possibly afterwards, until the wood burns up, with the result that their quarters when they retire may have a temperature of about 70° F., and as the fire goes out it will fall so by morning it may have dropped to nearly zero, as was the case while we were there. Under such conditions the men are either too warmly covered in the early part of the night or not sufficiently by morning. It is believed that it would be advantageous if the men were to retire in cold tents, so that when covering themselves for the night the temperature conditions might more nearly approximate those of the morning. Whether it would be practical to have the men retire in cold quarters, we may not say, as it would require that the men spend at least the latter part of the evening before retiring in the mess hall, so that their tent fires might be extinguished."

Mr. GLASS was given leave by unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. FLOOD. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. I thought that the gentleman would take up all the afternoon, and I was obliged to give 15 minutes time that I had promised to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] to the gentleman from Virginia. I want to ask unanimous consent when we get into the House that Mr. RAINEY may address the House for 15 minutes to-morrow morning.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I might find some one that would want to use the balance of the time that I have. I will consent to the gentleman's request if the gentleman will agree that these men who are not here or some other person may have 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUMPHREYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9314, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns this afternoon it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I understand it is the purpose to take up the bill under the five-minute rule to-morrow.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think there is no occasion to inconvenience Members by bringing them here that early, and I object.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill may be concluded to-morrow in 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by me and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. LONDON. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] informed me that he was going to speak on the breaking up of the convention of Social Democrats in South Dakota. If he speaks on that subject, I want 5 or 10 minutes to reply. Will the gentleman make it 40 minutes?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] notify the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LONDON. The gentleman from Illinois was kind enough to let me know that he was going to speak on that subject and asked me to be present.

Mr. FLOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I make it 40 minutes, so that the gentleman from New York may have 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 40 minutes, he to have 15 minutes, the gentleman from Wisconsin 15 minutes;

and if the gentleman from Illinois discourses on the North Dakota incident the gentleman from New York shall have 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 8, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of State to complete the arrangements and provide for the entertainment of the Fifteenth International Congress Against Alcoholism, to be held in the United States (H. Doc. No. 920); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting list of executive papers not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the department and have no permanent or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 921); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9641) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 287), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9248) to prevent extortion, to impose taxes upon certain incomes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 288), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 235) granting to certain persons in the active war service an extension of time within which applications for insurance may be made under section 401 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 289), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8125) for the relief of James W. Kingon, and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 9642) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing for war needs; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9643) to provide for the traveling expenses of soldiers in the United States Army when on furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9644) authorizing the Secretary of War to remove or dispose of timber on the Three Tree Point Military Reservation and the Fort Canby Military Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9645) providing for the appointment of inspectors to take the state of the meters for the gas and electric light consumers of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9646) to fix the price of gas in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9647) to provide for the issuing of circulating notes of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9648) fixing the maximum price of electric current to consumers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 9649) for enlistment and appointment of officers in the National Guard, District of Columbia, during the period of the war; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 245) to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to report to Congress immediately what steps, if any, have been taken by them to enforce section 11 of an act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to bring a suit in equity in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to dissolve the corporation known as the Washington Gas Light Co."; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 9641) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; committed to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9650) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 9651) granting a pension to Marion Rosser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9652) granting a pension to Robert Donson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9653) granting an increase of pension to Hugh M. Costner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9654) granting an increase of pension to Abner D. Rutherford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9655) granting an increase of pension to Luther S. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9656) granting an increase of pension to Isaac S. Brundage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9657) for the relief of Benjamin F. Burch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 9658) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9659) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Hereford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9660) granting a pension to Elizabeth Munday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9661) granting a pension to Colann Blakely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9662) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Points; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9663) granting a pension to Henry Borghardt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9664) granting a pension to Samuel D. Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9665) granting a pension to Flora A. Hubbard and her minor children; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 9666) for the relief of Stephen J. Haff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9667) granting an increase of pension to John M. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9668) to correct the military record of Alfred J. Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 9669) granting an increase of pension to Newell S. Lord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9670) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Boyce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBY: A bill (H. R. 9671) granting an increase of pension to Lambert Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9672) granting an increase of pension to Warren F. Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 9673) for the relief of Nathan B. Wilber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 9674) granting an increase of pension to Alfred J. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9675) granting a pension to Stella Archer Simson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 9676) granting an increase of Pension to Daniel Ault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the grand jury of the United States district court at Juneau, Alaska, affirming their loyalty, and pledging their best efforts to bring the war to a successful termination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the National Single Tax League, favoring legislation to raise Federal revenue through land-value taxes, and protesting against the Fletcher bill, appropriating \$50,000,000 to pay landowners for what the club calls "legalized blackmail"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of the Vermont Dairymen's Association, favoring the bill authorizing an increased appropriation for the control and eradication of tuberculosis among live stock and food animals, and protesting against the removal of the tax on colored oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of the Massachusetts Dairymen's Association, for repeal of the second-class postage provision of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the La Salle Portland Cement Co., of La Salle, Ill., relative to improvement of inland waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial adopted by a convention of short-line railroads, relative to pending railroad legislation. Also a petition of the Westchester County (N. Y.) Commission of Safety, for the daylight-saving bill; to the Commission on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Vincent Veprek, Boston, Mass., requesting that the independence of the Czech-Slovaks be recognized and a Czech-Slovak State be organized; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Petition of the Delta Shakespeare Club, of Lake Village, Ark., favoring the repeal of zone rates system of postage on second-class periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the Civic Club of Philadelphia, protesting against the zonal system as applied to postal rates for periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Memorial of Maryland State Board of Forestry, favoring S. 3344; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Oriole Branch No. 176, National Association of Letter Carriers, favoring H. R. 9414; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. E. Jackson Lumber Co., Baltimore, Md., opposing the eight-hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of P. Gallagher Realty Co. and J. A. Bokel Co., opposing repeal of zone system for periodicals, and of A. N. Fleagle, favoring such repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of the Woman's City Club, of Long Beach, Cal., protesting against the zone postal amendment to the war-revenue bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of citizens of York, N. Y., in public meeting, urging the passage by Congress of emergency war prohibition measures; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Ossian Church, Dansville, N. Y., urging the passage of emergency war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of residents of Attica, N. Y., in mass meeting, urging the passage by Congress of a resolution to amend the Federal Constitution to prohibit polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the congregations of the Methodist and Congregational Churches of Arcade, N. Y., urging the passage by Congress of national emergency war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Andrew Barber and 44 other residents of Greigsville, N. Y., urging the passage by Congress of immediate emergency war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mr. J. W. Bray and 16 other gentlemen, urging the passage by Congress of an amendment to the Federal draft law permitting the sons of farmers to be furloughed for work on the farms during the summer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of various farmers in the thirty-third New York district for relief in the conditions surrounding the production of crops and the securing of adequate help; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: Papers to accompany House bill 8125, for the relief of James W. Kinzon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of William W. Cotton, forest commissioner, city of Newton, Mass., on Senate bill 3344; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 8, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our heavenly Father, we come to Thee for Thy blessing. Realizing our position and our responsibility in the strife of the world to-day, we come to Thee for wisdom and we look up to Thee for Thy guiding hand. We are still dependent upon Thee, O God. Thou art the Creator of all worlds, the Ruler over all nations, and the Judge of all men. We humble ourselves therefore under Thy mighty hand and trust in Thy almighty power. May we seek our peace and safety, our successes and triumphs, only in harmony with Thy righteous laws. May Thy servants in the Senate to-day, in all their deliberations, reflect to the honor of Thy name in the accomplishment of Thy purposes, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following communication, which will be inserted in the RECORD and placed on file.

The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Bismarck, N. Dak., February 4, 1918.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Agreeable to a resolution adopted by the fifteenth legislative assembly in extraordinary session, I am inclosing a copy of resolution relating to the ratification of amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the manufacture, sale, and use of intoxicating liquors.

Yours, very truly,

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Department of State, State of North Dakota.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota, do hereby certify that the attached resolution is a true and complete copy of a certain concurrent resolution adopted by the fifteenth legislative assembly in extraordinary session beginning January 23 and ending January 29, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighteen.

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., on this 30th day of January, A. D. 1918.

[SEAL.]

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

A joint resolution (H. R. 8) ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America. (Introduced by Mr. Harris.)

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States of America, at the second session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made and passed the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America, in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution

be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States, as provided by the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —, SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by Congress."

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, duly convened, That the said foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States of America, at Washington, to the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Approved 4.45 p. m., January 28, 1918.

LYNN J. FRAZIER, Governor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS presented a petition of Charles Herzer Camp, No. 22, of Dodge City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Chinese Expedition, and the Philippine Insurrection, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a pharmaceutical corps in the Army, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture remonstrating against the repeal of the present rate on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of Forest Grange, No. 362, Patrons of Husbandry, of Big Rapids, Mich., praying for a repeal of the zone rate of postage on magazines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Adrian, Mich., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Merchants' Association of Cadillac, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation raising the rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of Slovak League, Local Branch No. 167, of New Britain; of the Bohemian National Alliance of New Britain; and of the Bohemian National Alliance Branch of Norwalk, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the liberation and unification of the Czecho-Slovaks of Austria-Hungary into one independent Czecho-Slovak State, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Milford, Conn., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram signed by the mayor and a large number of prominent citizens of the mining district of Ely, in my State.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELY, NEV., January 31, 1918.

Senator CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
Washington, D. C.:

In common with the patriotic people of every community in this country, we are behind President Wilson to the limit. He should have an absolutely free hand in the conduct of the war. We oppose any legislation tending to hamper him in the slightest degree. We are likewise opposed to public investigations and public detailed criticisms at this time because of furnishing beneficial information to the enemy and material for publication in hostile countries, which will unquestionably prolong the war by giving people of those nations false impressions as to our unity of purpose. If investigations and criticisms must be had, we favor strict executive sessions. If any Congressman never makes mistakes, let him stand up. This is no time for public speeches denunciatory of the work of the administration in conduct of the war, but rather for the active aid and assistance of every patriotic citizen, including certain Members of Congress. Politics must not be allowed to interfere. This is going to be an unhealthy country